This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE CHURCH

AND

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Digitized by Google

Reviewed in the Contemporary Review. July, 1892.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE FIRST EDITION.

'A healthy and very timely contribution to the study of Christian ethics and sociology.'—*The Independent.*

'This is a large book on a large subject by a writer who has the courage of his convictions, and who, believing the gospel is adequate for settling our social problems in a satisfactory humanitarian way, confronts, in a whole-hearted manner, the problems of old and new political economy, the land and labour questions, co-operation, sweating, child-life, and the place of women in the movement of the race.'—*Liverpool Mercury.*

'Mr. Matheson's sound and rational words of advice come in good time to direct fresh attention to the subject.'—*Literary World.*

'The author is evidently anxious to be impartial and fair, and has taken the trouble to read extensively and to think carefully on the various questions passed in review.'—*London Quarterly.*

'The addresses are capital summaries of the case for advanced social Christian opinions. They are full of facts, figures, and quotations, and are, to the amateur in such subjects, a perfect mine of information and suggestion.'—*Methodist Times.*

'The book contains a vast amount of interesting information, concisely put together, and is brightly and thoughtfully written.'—*The Darkest England Gazette.*

'The author treats each problem in a broad and liberal spirit, and shows throughout a thorough grasp of the different subjects he deals with.'—*Northern Whig* (Belfast).

'As a popular exposition of the problems with which Church and State are alike attempting to deal, Mr. Matheson's book may be recommended.'—*British Weekly.*

'Its author is well read in the literature of political and social economy, and has thought independently on the problems which he so ably discusses.'—*Montrose Review.*

'The book is one of the best of its kind which we have seen, and will be found a useful compendium of valuable thoughts and facts to all who are engaged in the study of social problems.'—*Glasgow Echo.*

'A volume of much value as a contribution to a solution of the acknowledged wants and crying social needs of the age in which we now live.'—*Manchester Courier.*

'A valuable contribution towards the solution of many of the important problems which at present so force themselves upon the attention of all thoughtful persons. The enormous accumulations of capital in the hands of a comparatively few, the deep and degrading poverty of large masses of the population, the depletion of the rural districts and overcrowding in great cities, the fierce struggles between capital and labour,—these are phenomena which amply justify the demand of our author "for a writer of original and independent ability" to do for the laws of distribution of wealth what Adam Smith did for the laws of its production. . . . The work has the merit of being written in singularly clear style; there is not an obscure sentence in it, and the reader who has a genuine interest in the subject will scarcely be inclined to lay it aside till he has read to the last page.'—*Scotsman.*

'We have read few books of late years that so admirably fulfil their purpose as does this one of Mr. Scott Matheson's. It is a most judicial and comprehensive survey of the whole social field; and we may say at the outset that the various essays are all and severally so well rounded, so well supplied with solid fact and vital illustration, that they will be of immense use to the social reformer as such, be he religious or not; more especially will they be of value to him that lectureth.'—*Daily Chronicle* (London).

'This is a volume of great interest, and deals in a very full and thorough way with the burning question of the relation of the Church to the various social problems which are forcing themselves on the attention of the community.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

'Full of information attractively presented.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

'After a preliminary statement on the two types of Political Economy which have come into contrast in our day, he deals with the land question, the labour question, the liquor question, the problems of poverty, housing, sweating, the co-operative movement, and other pressing difficulties of the time. He has no novel specific to offer, neither does he make any startling or revolutionary proposal. But he shows a keen sense of the urgency of these problems, and a large knowledge of the circumstances which go to form them. He offers many just remarks on the Church's duty in relation to them, and writes in a hopeful strain with regard to the issue.'—*Critical Review.*

'Deserves to be widely read and carefully considered, if only for its numerous illustrative facts.'—*North British Daily Mail.*

'We have nothing but commendation for this intelligent and useful book.'—*Christian Leader.*

'The evident sincerity with which this work is written, together with its scholarly character and literary excellence, gives it a claim to the attention of all who are interested in the relation of modern Christianity to the movements of modern life.'—*Newcastle Daily Leader.*

Digitized by Google

THE CHURCH

AND

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

BY

A. SCOTT MATHESON

AUTHOR OF 'THE GOSPEL AND MODERN SUBSTITUTES'

SECOND EDITION

EDINBURGH & LONDON

OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER

1894

Digitized by Google

JAN 1 [illegible] 1890
Divinity School

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Crown 8vo, cloth, price 5s.

The Gospel and Modern Substitutes

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THIS Christian study of Social Problems, while urging a plea for sympathetic consideration on the part of the Church, at the same time affirms that the Gospel of Christian redemption is the one great panacea for the evils of our time. Individual conversion has always been regarded as a primary note of the Church's testimony, yet the Gospel for the day should recognise social interests as an important part of its message, and sweep within sacred lines every department of human life and activity. Social reform ought never to draw the Church aside from her proper work of saving men, but the Church cannot well stand aside from the paths of social reform. After much study and long trial of methods in Home Mission work, the writer is convinced that efforts at social amelioration should be as comprehensive and many-sided as the evils we have to combat. The Church, to recall a sentence from *The Speaker*, must utter to the people a great *Sursum corda*—a summons to the national mind to elevate itself to the level of the mighty problems of a completely new era. In this volume an attempt is made to examine some of these problems with honesty and candour, while a larger aim throughout has

Digitized by Google

been to indicate the lines of a democratic development, according to the ethical ideal of Christ. It is, therefore, a contribution to applied Christianity, and, with the prayer for God's will to be done on earth as it is in heaven, the author sends it forth on his Master's service.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
I.	THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS	1
II.	SMITH'S 'WEALTH OF NATIONS' AND 'THEORY OF MORAL SENTIMENTS'	26
III.	POLITICAL ECONOMY—OLD AND NEW	41
IV.	THE LAND QUESTION—LANDLORDISM	59
V.	THE LAND QUESTION—LAND REFORM	72
VI.	THE LABOUR QUESTION—HOURS	95
VII.	THE LABOUR QUESTION—WAGES	112
VIII.	THE LIQUOR QUESTION	133
IX.	THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY	158
X.	THE PROBLEM OF BETTER HOUSING	181
XI.	THE PROBLEM OF SWEATING	210
XII.	THE PROBLEM OF CHILD LIFE AND RESCUE	233
XIII.	THE PROBLEM OF WOMAN'S PLACE AND INFLUENCE	262
XIV.	THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT	291
XV.	COMMONWEALTHS—IDEAL AND ACTUAL	316
XVI.	THE CITY OF GOD	345

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

I.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN RELATION TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

A FEW years ago Bismarck told the world that there is a Social Question, and every year since then the world has seen it rising into graver aspect among the foremost communities of Europe and America. The Social Question, as one of public well-being, demands everywhere to be heard, everywhere to be dealt with, everywhere to be solved. It is the life and death question of this and the next generation, gazing at and transfixing us, like the old Sphinx with its insoluble weird face, or ready, like another Frankenstein, to pursue with horrible hate and nameless cruel wrongs the very civilisation that has called it into existence. All the best thought of our own and other countries turns to this momentous subject. It is the duty of all men, and especially of large representative bodies of men, to turn their minds with what light and leading they have to an examination of Social Problems. There are four ways of dealing with them: we may ignore them, only to find ourselves playing the part of fools; or we may run away from them, only to play the part of cowards; or we may handle them rashly, only to play the part of fanatics; or we may study them thoroughly, and act the part of wise men.

We cannot, and must not, ignore these great social problems. They front us, and affront us, whether we will or not. Ignor-

Digitized by Google

ance here is neither wise nor expedient. The world was never converted by silence, and we are at a point of social pressure where to keep silence is little less than immoral. On many of these questions light may still be wanting, but it is better found by seeking it than by sitting in a cave. The policy which does not contradict ignorance, or vex it by unwelcome enlightenment, but addresses it just as it wants to be addressed, is a blind and foolish policy. There is no pessimism so bad as the optimism which lightly trips past social misery, and thinks nothing need be done.

We cannot, and ought not to, run away from these problems. No doubt, they are matters before which the strongest have trembled, and in which the wisest have erred. But their critical and difficult nature should not be an occasion for retreat or fear. The argument *in terrorem* is not one for manly hearts. Recommending itself as safe, it is full of risk. It never stopped inquiry, and never will: it stirs reaction in honest and honourable minds. The attempt to screw down the safety-valve must be abandoned as a fatuous policy. For this evasion of responsibility, through an abject desire to be safe, defeats itself, and brings on the coward the very evil he wants to shun. No doubt, the problems confronting us are grave—so grave that there is fear they may not be solved in time to prevent greater catastrophes. There is danger in reckless change, but there is greater danger in blind conservatism. Among those who have caught sight of the Social Question in its real magnitude, not a few are like the unbelieving spies who brought back an evil report of Canaan, making much of the giant obstacles; but the true counsel, now as of old, is what Caleb and Joshua gave, 'Let us go up at once and possess the land, for we are well able to conquer it.' There are forms of the 'inhumanity of man to man,' to grapple with which staggers the hopefullest. The boys of Verona used to whisper, as Dante passed, 'There goes the man who has seen hell.' We have looked into the Inferno of this nineteenth century's social woes—hells on earth into which no breath of heaven ever comes; and, once we have looked, we are tempted to turn away in heart-broken anguish,

Digitized by Google

but the higher conscience bids us haste to the rescue, with fixed resolve that no study of ours shall make us faint, and no effort of ours shall be spared that may contribute to turn out, instead of new generations of social wreckage, new men and women worthy of the kingdom of God.

We should not handle these questions rashly, unskilfully, or fanatically. The hasty adventure of unreasoned excursion into such regions must be as carefully avoided as the timid avoidance of them. All angry statements, such as 'the war against accursed Capital,' or 'cut-throat competition,' only serve to provoke heated passion, and alienate temperate minds from taking part in needed reforms. All violent proposals to subvert the existing order, and hasten it by revolution and dynamite, only work mischief. Karl Marx declared that Bakunin, the father of modern Anarchism, was the worst enemy the working man ever had. Intolerance, fanaticism, passion and prejudice of every kind ought to be abjured; they can forward no cause, least of all, the cause of public welfare. In the great enterprise of social improvement, never should we let the spirit of party politics, or the spirit of religious rivalry intrude. When we say this, we do not mean to aver that it is wrong to belong to one or another of the great parties in the State, nor have we any sympathy with the view that religion has nothing to do with politics. We cannot isolate religion and make it a kingdom in the air; for it has relations and affinities with every phase of life, whether it be personal, economical, social, or national. The 'water-tight compartment' idea of Christianity does not harmonise with Christ's parable that the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal. The kingdom of Christ reaches to where no state can go—to the heart and conscience, and then out over all. Politics in the future will have to deal with social questions more than at present, and party spirit will therefore become more acrimonious and prejudiced in this direction. It is desirable that outside the arena of rival parties we should have generated ideals that may be despised quixotisms

Digitized by Google

to the partisan politician, but become progressive and elevating forces in the future; and it is still more so, that outside there should be the momentum, or driving force, of a slow, sure, and enlightened public opinion to promote all good efforts in behalf of the condition of the people.

We ought to consider these questions calmly, to study them carefully, and act towards them the part of wise men. They need sober and sagacious treatment, for they are often profoundly intricate, and difficult to unravel in their causes and effects. For a clear understanding of the subjects before us, it is of the utmost importance to have rigid accuracy in the statement of facts pertaining to social conditions, and to bring wisdom, insight, discrimination, and infinite patience to the study of remedies. It is the duty of all men to study the Social Question—of the statesman from a political standpoint, of the reformer from a humanitarian standpoint, and of the Christian from the standpoint of the spiritual mind. The Social Question, being the greatest national question of our time, is at bottom a religious question, affecting the whole status, spirit, and health of modern society; and no power on earth is better fitted to deal with it than the Church, in the light of Christ and His kingdom. The evils to be coped with under this Question are to be found everywhere, and constitute the chief hindrances to the Church's life and work. Millions of friendless and godless people inhabit the land, and their lot, both as to habitation, food, and employment, is a living reproach to our opulent civilisation, and an open scandal to our comfortable Christianity. It is true that individual regeneration and sanctification is the vital solution; it is true that we need an intensification of faith in the supernatural; it is true that the power to change the heart and set the life right must come from Christ. Development is not wholly determined by environment, and never was. Better surroundings help, but the real inspiration must come from within, or, as I prefer to state it, from above. All this evangelic truth we hold and emphasise; but have not many who hold and emphasise it forgotten some-

Digitized by Google

thing? When Lazarus was to be raised from the dead, only Christ's life-giving word could do it; but before it could find access to the tomb, the stone had to be taken away. Ignorance, facilities to intemperance, unwholesome dwellings, inadequate wages, want of leisure,—such are the stones lying on the graves of the spiritually dead: and a voice from heaven asks, in many a bitter cry to-day, 'Have ye taken away the stones?' Have not those who work on more spiritual levels forgotten the toils that are needed to prepare the moral or material environments, without which their higher labours are all in vain?

But the Church's duty is not only to spread a knowledge of the menacing conditions which lie at the base of the social fabric; it has likewise a positive and constructive work to discharge. It is the proper function of the Church to think out and formulate the moral law of Christ as applicable to modern conditions, in order that a truer public sentiment may be cultivated, and prevail among us, as theological opinion has prevailed; and that the Church itself may stand out again in the public eye as a body which has a clearly understood moral code for politics and industry and property, and especially for the social inequalities and miseries of our age. If we would be servants of Jesus Christ at whatever cost, we must place ourselves again at His feet, as He sits upon the Mount and opens His mouth to teach us the laws of His kingdom, and shows us their bearing on matters that concern the life of commerce, or the relations between Capital and Labour, or the administration of justice, or the tone of public morals, or the mutual obligations of classes to one another.

The best men in all the religious communities of our land have been constrained to face social grievances and bestir themselves to a consideration of the means of help. A distinguished German, speaking of his own country, says: 'The decision as to which Church will gain the greatest influence over the life of the people will not be on the field of learned deductions, nor in the domain of dogmatic polemic, but the Social Question is the field on which the decisive battle must be fought.' The Pope,

Digitized by Google

in his Encyclical on Labour, declares the Social Question to be of graver and more urgent importance than ever, and bids every Catholic priest deal with it. Cardinal Manning wrote to young Catholics in these terms: 'We are strangled by an exaggerated individualism, and next century will show that human society is greater and more noble than all that is purely individual. The twentieth century will be wholly that of the people, and of the laws of the common prosperity of a Christian *régime*.' Dr. Westcott, Bishop of Durham, told the Hull Congress of the Anglican Church that churchmen were asked 'to consider theories and problems, the idea of social organisation, the ethics of industrial enterprise, the spiritual responsibility of employers, the present relationship of Capital and Labour, the crowding of masses of men in small spaces, the passion for gambling.' General Booth has added Social Reform to his religious crusade, and gives the reason in his notable book: 'I must assert in the most unqualified way that it is primarily and mainly for the sake of saving the soul that I seek to save the body. But what is the use of preaching the Gospel to men whose whole attention is concentrated upon a mad, desperate struggle to keep themselves alive?' The Congregational Union of England and Wales has appointed a committee to deal with social questions, and to give information and assistance in furtherance of upward social movements. To the Church of Scotland is the credit due of being the first religious body in the land to take up the question of the better housing of the poor, and issuing a most instructive report on the subject.

Such signs of awakenment point out the path along which the Church of Christ ought to move in reasserting its spiritual authority and fulfilling its function of moral witness to the community. Witnessing for righteousness, holding up the golden rule everywhere, are the chief 'notes' of a Church, and through the entire range of the Social Question should these notes be felt and acknowledged.

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest accords with the need of the time.

Digitized by Google

It is a fine characteristic of the men of Issachar that they were 'men that had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do.' Our Lord condemns the official representatives of religion in His day because they could not discern the signs of the times. We plead for an interest in current questions to show that we thoroughly appreciate the times we live in, and want to interpret the message of the Church in accordance both with the novelty of the age and the antiquity of the truth, which is also what Paul means by 'interpreting unknown tongues.' The epoch we live in is one of profound transformation, intellectual and social, abounding in new needs, new points of view, and new aspirations. In face of such a state of things, the Church ought to manifest its plastic and creative power. Institutions, like organisms, must adapt themselves to their environment, or perish. Want of adaptation is death. Stagnation is not a worthy ideal for living bodies. Development must not be hampered by blind conservatism. But where life is in a Church, there will be the promise and power of adaptation to the varying circumstances of the age in which it is cast: where there is life, there is infinite power of adjustment. The new man must feel that he is new, and has not come to be mortgaged to the past—to the dead and gone; working in the new time he must work by new methods. There is no attractiveness like that of a new man, or of a Church full of new men, who say, 'Old things are passed away, behold, all things are new.' The Church of Christ can keep abreast of the age only by the possession of an open mind, flexibility of movement, and resourcefulness of effort.

Now before the Church lies the Social Question in its terrible perplexity, asking to be examined and resolved. Man is himself the Sphinx, the grave problem, and Christ, the Face of God, is the solution of it. There is urgent need for bringing the resources of this Gospel to bear on the great problems agitating our time with reference to the regeneration of society, the restoration of the family to the Christian ideal, the termination of the conflicts between Capital and Labour, and the social

Digitized by Google

improvement of the people. The Church has not kept hold of the public conscience on these matters, but has withdrawn to monastic habits in the interests of a so-called peace and undisturbed spirituality. It has aimed to do more for man in the next life than for the life that now is, while it has forgotten those material improvements which, we know, are the solid basis for moral and spiritual advancement. If we do not look at this matter largely, taking material as well as spiritual and spiritual as well as material considerations into account, we are sure to suffer the moral retributions which are brought about by the avenging years; and the class which suffers most eventually is not the class which is neglected but that which neglects. The Church of Christ suffers in this way, for one of the gravest and most ominous facts of our time is, that the great proportion of the people are outside all churches, alienated by misunderstanding or neglect; and the outsiders grow impatient, believing that in the idea of a kingdom of God there must be hope of a justice not yet made explicit, and of which the avowed preachers of that kingdom have not said all that might be expected of them. Our sympathy with present-day questions ought, therefore, to be deep and resonant, if we are to gain true leverage over social forces. If the Church ignore the paramount importance of these questions, it can have no distinctive message for the age, inasmuch as these are *the* questions of the day, and will become so more and more. In their very existence we find an argument and an appeal to the Church to adapt itself to the changing time. Such enlargement of outlook as shall embrace social questions, along with problems of spiritual life, is imperative, in order that the Church may bear a living message to the people. They are asking for a Gospel that shall make this life healthier and brighter, and are no longer content to toil like slaves for a few commercial potentates, and patiently wait for compensation in another world. Let us have full sympathy with everything human in the present, and, while holding firmly the central truth as it is in Christ, let us be as much aglow with social interests as are the most ardent reformers of our time.

Digitized by Google

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest puts it in line with the democracy.

In the doctrines of brotherhood, of equal consideration and opportunity for each to realise his own nature, of doing to others as we would be done by, the Gospel furnishes the main principles of a democratic order of society. The Church, as embodying those principles, is a spiritual democracy. Historically, it sprang from the people. Its Founder was a man of the people, and the Friend of the poor; and its strength lies in being broad-based on the people's will. As one who enfranchised the people, Jesus Christ is the Author of democracy. This seminal idea is inherent in His Gospel, and surely, though slowly, advances to realisation wherever the Gospel obtains a footing. There was democracy in the Greek States, and its administration was more regular, honest, and successful in every way than that of any other State in the ancient world, but the people proper, or lower orders, existed in a state of slavery. Great and long-continued struggles between despotism and liberty have been carried on in this country; at length the principle of liberty has broadened down to rule by the people and for the people. The power that once belonged to the upper ranks, and has been for the greater part of this century in the hands of the middle class, and still largely remains there, has *de jure* passed into the hands of the working classes, and will be *de facto* in their possession ere the century is dead. What will they do with it? No doubt they will take hold of their inheritance, and use it to extend their rights and liberties. King Demos, remembering how his predecessors thought mainly of themselves in what they put into the statute-book of the realm, will be tempted to do likewise. He may be hurried on to do hasty and wrong things, but on the whole he has learned by long precedent the folly of heated passions and the danger of revolutionary measures. Too often in the controversies of the present century as to the franchise, commerce, labour, and religion, the wealthy, titled, and privileged classes have been in the wrong, while the broad healthy mind of the nation and

Digitized by Google

its strong sense of justice have discovered and taken the path that ought to be followed. There is truth in the observation that 'the people as a whole are calm, sober-minded, anxious to be and to do the right, and ready to learn from any capable teacher the way of action and the ends to be secured'; and everything depends on whether they shall be left to the wild proposals of agitators or the wise guidance of the Gospel for the bringing about of a true social order.

It is the duty of the Church, therefore, to hail the advent of democracy, to ally itself in every helpful way with the new constituency, and to turn its face towards the rising sun. The link of connection between the Church and the democracy is to be found in a deep, careful, and patient study of social problems. For they are the people's questions, and on a right settlement of them does the common weal depend. The principles of a reconstructed society are not yet understood, though the age is in a ferment of ideas about them; we have those principles wrapped up in our Gospel of the Kingdom of God, but they need to be mastered by the Church, freely discussed and fully wrought out, with the view of being taught to the people, and ultimately acted upon in the work of reform. This view needs insistence as much to awaken the conventionalism within the Church itself as to correct crude schemes of social redress that appeal so readily to the miseries of the unfortunate.

We must readjust our ideas and methods to the spirit of democratic development. From political teachers the people expect a good deal, but from their religious guides, who undertake to direct life by a finer inspiration, they expect much more. They have been taught to regard the Church as the avowed foe of monopoly and privilege, the fearless advocate of justice between class and class, and the active friend of all causes in their behalf. It maintains that a peer ought to be in no better position than anybody else—that a man is not to be regarded as more than a man because of his rank or wealth, nor as less than a man because he has neither of these advantages; and they look for the vindication of such a democratic

Digitized by Google

view. It is felt more and more that true popular freedom is impossible without economic independence behind it. The oppressions of monopoly, the revolts of labour, and the upheavals of popular discontent should bring awakenment to the Church and evoke sympathy with the efforts of the people to gain sweeter and freer conditions of life. It should be free from all suspicion of class favouritism. What moral effect can the pulpit have when the preacher studies the tastes and prejudices of plutocratic pews, and the people note the alliance of pastors and masters, and come to believe that the pastors defer to the masters, while caring little for the poor? Let the ministers of Christ sympathise with the workers, guide them with their wisdom, and help them to obtain better conditions in life, and the future of this country will be in the hands of a Christian democracy; but if they will not take a rightful stand in the people's cause, the people will follow those leaders who ignore religion, and the Church will miss its grand opportunity of becoming victorious over the world. To become thus victorious, it will be the duty of the Church to welcome such democratic institutions as village, municipal, and county councils, and use them as fit organs for realising Christian ideals, and carrying out such operations as the housing of the poor and temperance reform. Such powers are likely to be given to these councils, and when they come, the Church should have its members taught in the obligations of Christian citizenship, and ready to play a yeoman's part in the cause of social progress. From the pulpit men should be urged to volunteer for Christ's service in municipalities and village councils just as they are urged to come out for service in the Sunday School and Home Mission work.

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest harmonises the best traditions of its history.

The Church of the first days was born in a baptism of the Spirit that obliterated the distinction between 'mine' and 'thine,' and constrained its members to have all things in common. On every page of the Christian Fathers the doctrine

Digitized by Google

of equal conditions is urged, and the painful contrasts between rich and poor are treated as unjust. Chrysostom says, 'Better all things were in common,' and Ambrose argues, 'Nature created community; private property is the offspring of usurpation.' During the Middle Ages communistic ideas were perpetuated in the Mendicant Orders, and the conventual system aimed at a realisation of the Christian ideal. The Reformation was a great and widespread movement in behalf of the people. John Knox, Andrew Melville, and Samuel Rutherford threw themselves, heart and soul, into the stirring events of their time. Erskine, Gillespie, and Chalmers were men of public spirit, men who studied the needs and championed the rights of the people. The Scottish Church has had, through all her history, competent sons, who were energetic fighters for the people's causes, men of Issachar every inch of them in the coolness of their judgment no less than in the warmth of their zeal. The Evangelical religion is most fruitful when it identifies itself with public interests. It led Howard to assail the brutalities of prison life with success. It nerved Wilberforce to overthrow the slave trade, and ultimately slavery itself. It animated Shaftesbury to head innumerable schemes of social reform, though it must be added to the shame of his Evangelical brethren that they opposed him with bitter words or stood by in doubt. The Mission of Nonconformity has never been 'chained to a creed of caste,' but has always been in furtherance of the liberties of the people. Within its bosom, during its first days, the forces of protest, independence, and national duty have been born, and have set its leaders in the van of 'Forward Movements.' They have advocated such measures as those of Electoral Reform, the Abolition of Slavery, Catholic Emancipation, National Education, and the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control. They were not slow to justify their convictions to the world on the great questions of their time; they were the last men to give the advice that the Church should keep to its praying and preaching, and not meddle with politics, and they would have been the last to take

Digitized by Google

it. If they rose again, would they advise us with cynical complacency to look on from our sacred enclosures at the full stream of social and industrial movements, but keep out of the swim, lest we should lose our lives? Such a view did not commend itself to them, nor should it commend itself to us. Surely it is pitiable to be told that we must not touch these social questions for fear of giving offence. The best traditions of the Church bid us accentuate faith in freedom as the condition of order and progress, emphasise hatred of monopoly and class privilege and time-serving policy, enthusiasm for morality in the lives of political leaders and in legislation. Whether it concerns drink or opium, impurity at home, or any traffic unjust to lower races abroad, the times call us again to such affirmations of the Christian conscience.

It is a complaint among the people that the Church has fallen out of step with them, and that the primary question is not a non-churchgoing community but a non-going Church—a Church too much at its ease in Zion, talking a theology they cannot understand, and neglecting a philanthropy they can well appreciate but do not behold. It is not necessary to exaggerate the gulf between the Church and the working classes; they form the *élite* of many a Christian congregation; but on the whole they have got to think that the Church is on the side of the strong against the weak, of the capitalist against the labourer, of the rich against the poor; and they resent being put off with promises of justice and happiness in another world. Do we not hear them saying it right out, with a bluntness that should make us wince, 'Give us no more of your promissory notes; we will cash no more of your bills on a future heaven. Instead of tracts, give us loaves. Instead of a house not made with hands, give us clean and wholesome dwellings. Instead of rest hereafter, give us leisure here to think about it.' The Church is to see God's will done on earth as it is done in heaven, and part of that will is to grapple with social wrongs, abolish poverty, and join in all lawful efforts to obtain for labour its due reward, and for the toilers a larger degree of

Digitized by Google

amenity in their lot. Let the Church in her several organisations rouse up and fulfil her God-given duty. If the great Evangelical Churches would, in face of common perils and gigantic national needs, combine their resources, they might show themselves worthy of the grand opportunities God has put within their reach. They should unite for a glorious advance. As the Prussian general Blücher was nicknamed 'Old Forwards,' because he lifted up his voice to utter the cry, 'Forward, the whole line!' so let the Church in all its divisions 'come to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.'

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest would restore the lost function of prophecy.

There is not much ground for fear, and none at all for irrational panic, regarding the Higher Criticism directed at present to the Old Testament. Investigations now going on will result, as all past investigations have resulted, in modifying somewhat traditional and mechanical views of Inspiration, but in communicating clearer knowledge of the truth. Ewald's studies have done more to throw light on the Old Testament than all the commentaries of English and American Protestants from the seventeenth century to the present time. One positive result of such research has been to restore the prophets to their true place in the history of religion by representing them not so much as foretellers of literal events as forthtellers of divine and eternal realities. They were organs of divine communication, chosen vessels of inspiration, men who stood in the Secret Place of the Most High, and made it a watch-tower from which to act as preachers of righteousness and Heralds of the Dawn. They were statesmen, social reformers, preachers upon public life, and patriots, whose souls were not only open to divine illuminations, but alive with the call to thrust aside all evil customs, hesitations, and timidities; not content to slip along through the world like a footman, to escape by silence or tact as many knocks as they could, but brave men ready for the battles of God, loving only the good, disdaining insincerities, anxious to speak the truth and do the right, let the consequences

Digitized by Google

be what they might. From this point of view the prophets are the most modern part of the Old Testament, and the origin of Christianity can be understood not merely as a fulfilment of their predictions, but as a revival of their teaching and spirit. The doctrine of inspiration has been surrendered, because it has suffered the perversion of being attributed in some miraculous way to a few persons in Old Testament ages, and at the beginning of the New Testament, but denied to all the rest, as if the direct touch, the actual inspiration of God, ended instead of beginning with Pentecost and inaugurating a dispensation of the Spirit. By reason of this error prophecy has become a lost function—an ancient memory, instead of an abiding force in the Church of Christ. The belief that God still speaks in it and through it has been greatly lost, and with it that moral function which in prophets of old was so steadfast, marked by keen insight and full of courage. Prophecy has gone out of the Church largely, and may be found now, if anywhere, in teachers like Emerson and Carlyle, Browning and Count Tolstoi. For vision of divine things, loyalty to truth, yearning for a better order, and gift of burning words to speak God's message to the age, do they not excel the Church's accredited messengers? 'From what British pulpit,' asks Professor Masson, 'from what thousand British pulpits, has there been poured into the veins of the British community within existing memory a tide of more stimulating and more rousing influence than that which came from the humble home of Carlyle at Chelsea?'

If Christian teachers shrink from the same position and the same tasks, stand dumb in confusion or pusillanimity before established abuses, or retire to their ease in what they maintain to be their better Zion, the result can only be an epidemic of scepticism as to the worth of religion. The gospel preacher, if a true minister of God, is to be in his way a prophet, a seer, an inspired speaker fresh from God, who reads the dominant tendencies of his age, and delivers his God's message to it. If he is in burning sympathy with the people's wrongs and aspirations, he will enact the rôle of a prophet; he will plant himself

Digitized by Google

strong, and doubt nothing; he will be afraid of no fact, careless of selfish interests, and will never disgrace his calling by prophesying smooth things; he will be first in the van of every battle with wrong, and of every movement for public well-being.

Can anything be sadder than the position assumed by many of the American clergy towards such a subject as slavery, which will always be looked upon as a black spot on American Christianity? There are other crusades before us, in which the prophets of Christ will have to act strenuously, and not be like dumb dogs. We stand on the threshold of the twentieth century, and at the end of it men will look back on the liquor traffic, with the enormous fortunes built up out of it, and wonder that it was ever tolerated by civilised nations; they will look back on the physically-pinched and vilely-kennelled people of to-day as we look on the brutal serf who was worse off than his master's hounds; they will look back on the system which drove young children into factories to make it possible for an operative's family to subsist, as we look back on the outrages of the naval pressgangs legalised for the glory of the British flag; they will look back on the present tenure of land, which permits one man to hold a county and starve off its population for deer-forests, as we look back on the despots who could sell a vast territory with all its inhabitants; they will look back on the custom of working by contract, and giving to a few the power of exploiting labour, as we look back on the villainies of the slave trade. God grant us in such great enterprises prophetic leaders, forthtellers of things divinely true, to which the hearts of men leap up in response, men who will shape the destinies of the people with an enthusiasm so broad and so strong as to be a prophecy of world-wide brotherhood and co-operation for the common good.

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest will bring out the ethical side of our Gospel.

It is a sign of the times that we are passing from doctrinal to ethical studies, and that Sociology has become the science of the reading public, just as theology was in Puritan times; it

Digitized by Google

is a sign pointing to new ideals of life and work, and to new applications of Christ's Gospel as a way of life, and as a standard for communities. The age is astir with dreams of new Commonwealths and schemes of social reconstruction, and to this great trend of thought, in our day, the Gospel needs to be adjusted. A more ethical teacher than Jesus Christ never spoke to men, and more ethical discourses than He preached were never heard. His one great Sermon has poured a flood of moral illumination over the world, and verified His title to be the 'Sun of Righteousness.' His Gospel is the 'Kingdom of God,' having for its fundamental law the law of righteousness, inward and personal, civic and public, impartial and universal. Its chief strength lies in its ethical content, product, and realisation. The ethics of Christ are peculiarly vital, penetrating, and character-making. Yet no department of study has been more neglected than this by the Evangelical Churches of our land. They have distrusted it as a thing of cold, pagan morality. Christian Ethics, so barren in this country, have been studied to good effect in Germany by eminent Christian scholars; and at length among ourselves the subject is gaining proper recognition.

The Kingdom of God, which Christ came to found, contains all the elements of the highest social regeneration. Its conception of order and progress is not individualistic but socialistic; not of a collection of individuals living one by one, apart from each other, in relations with God, but of an organism in which every limb has its own function, and exercises it for the health of the whole. Its moral programme—its Manifesto—is the Sermon on the Mount. Christian morality has its basis in Christian theology, for the corner-stones which knit them into one are the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Some would divorce morality from religion, holding that to 'seek the face of God' is a pursuit of the Holy Grail that ends the Knighthood of the soul, and breaks up society. But this is a mistake. Never can we let go the clasp of God's Fatherhood in Christ, if we would brothers be. It was the Apostles, full of the

Digitized by Google

vision of Christ, who turned the world upside down, and helped to turn it right side up.

The Kingdom of God, so prominently enunciated by Christ in the Synoptic Gospels, has not its true place yet either in theology or Church teaching; but the school of Ritschl, who compares Christianity to an ellipse with two foci,—the Kingdom of God and Redemption,—is raising it to its proper place, and students of that school in this country are beginning to recognise the manifold ethical and organic ideas contained in Christ's Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Much needs still to be done in modifying the eschatological view of that Kingdom, which tends to remove it from earth to heaven, and in laying stress on it as a reign of justice, love, and brotherhood among men here. The trend of the best thinking fortunately is, and promises to be, still more and more in this latter direction. The Kingdom of God is the leaven which Christ says shall yet penetrate and transform society in every possible sphere of life.

Christian morality sets forth God as an ethical Being, whose character unveils itself in a Law that is holy, just, and good. That law is still further opened out in the Sermon on the Mount, and there it is focalised into one white light in the Golden Rule of doing to others what we would have them do to us. Such a rule, adjusted to the golden standard of heaven, and applied to the affairs of earth, contains in a short and handy form, all the principles that go to make a true Commonwealth according to Christ. It contains the principle of justice, which Plato, in the *Republic*, tries over and over again to explain, but with little success. As it glows in the Golden Rule, justice includes the free play of individual character, the equal right of each to realise his nature and be what God meant him to be; it also includes that each man counts one, and nobody more than one; while it rises out of individualism into the great thought of the community, and sets forth fellowship, brotherhood, and co-operation. In the faith of a common Father, men are brethren, members of a kingdom in which righteousness is the law, and mutual service is the privilege;

Digitized by Google

where every man has heritage to a place in the world, and may add wealth and diversity to social life by being himself out and out; where every man at the same time is his brother's keeper, so that the strong shall help the weak; where possession is only stewardship and duties are put before rights. Such are a few developments of the Ethics of Christ, not only taught by Him, but incarnate and enthroned in Him as a living Ideal. 'To discuss the legislation of Christ is to discuss His character; for it may be justly said that Christ Himself is the Christian law.'[1]

In presence of the Social Question this ethical side of the Gospel needs to be afresh exhibited and applied. Undeveloped resources still lie in Christ's conception of the Kingdom of God as the Kingdom of the Highest Good, and it is the Church's duty to bring out these reserves. New applications may be made of ethical principles, which it is the part of the intellectual duty of faith to make in every age. It is the Church's work in this age to preach the Social Gospel that makes a divine Christ all in all, or not at all, in the whole life of society. Men have a consciousness that the Gospel, in its character as a moral Dynamic, is something far broader, more human and more divine, than its best exponents have yet revealed. They have a conviction that man's destiny on this earth is more intimately connected with it than has been believed. In many quarters there grows a feeling that the Church is called to enter upon developments along social and ethical lines which have not been followed with the vigour that is now possible. It needs to work for the highest and broadest interests of humanity, as they are distributed in the various functions of education and science, politics and commerce. It should bring Christian morality to bear on the social disorders that need to be redressed. Louis Kossuth was asked to suggest a remedy for existing evils, and at first said, 'God only knows the remedy,' but, after a pause, he added, 'If the doctrines of Christianity, that are found in the New Testament, could be applied to human society, I believe the solution of the Social Problem

[1] *Ecce Homo*, chap. x.

Digitized by Google

could be got at.' If our aim be to retain the people in allegiance to Christ's supremacy, and to permeate society with the best spirit, this can only be done by showing that 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God' contains not only the promise of individual salvation, but likewise the clue to all social and economic difficulties. So far from these Social Problems usurping too much of the attention of the Church, they are only beginning to find a serious place in its thoughts at all, and they furnish it with a providential test and favourable opportunity for showing that the Gospel of Christ is the power of God to social as well as to personal salvation.

The Church ought to interest itself in Social Problems, because such interest will counteract the Commercialism of our time.

During this century an Industrial Revolution has occurred, not less fateful to the people of Great Britain than the French Revolution was to the people of France. Its chief factors were the inventions at the end of the eighteenth century—the steam-engine and the spinning-jenny—and the inventions of our century—the railway, steam navigation, and the telegraph. Steam power in this country alone is equal to the manual power of the whole human race throughout the world. Its leading changes were a quick transition from cottage to factory methods of production, the drafting of population to new centres, and the growth of towns. And the results of this silent, but sudden, revolution have given us the advantage of half a century's start over the other nations of Europe, and an increase of unexampled wealth which has gone forward by leaps and bounds. The passion for accumulating riches has become a characteristic of our age; the Gospel of Getting On is a Gospel for the day, and its apostles clench it with the proverbial half-crown as the only coin in the pocket of the man of wealth when he began to climb the ladder of fortune. But there has been no law or arrangement for distributing this vast growth of wealth among the people; it has been headed up into the tremendous power of Capital, and into a form of Mammonism which proves hostile to the Church as a power

Digitized by Google

that makes for spirituality. We oppose the spiritual authority which prevents the investigation of truth, but should hail the spiritual authority that confronts the kings whom Mammon has crowned, and uses the whip of cords to drive out the profane traders that make God's House a house of merchandise. The prophets of Christ ought to confront kings and commons alike with a fearless mien.

Some of us have noted for a quarter of a century the growing commercialism of the age, the growing worldliness of the Church, the growing subserviency to wealth, and the growing disposition to apply material standards of success to spiritual work. These things have been to us as the 'burden of the Lord,' and in bearing it we have sometimes met with a prophet's reward. It is not, however, from the Church and its ministers that clearest perceptions of, and loudest protests against, the nature and tendency of the existing industrial order have for half a century proceeded, but from laic guides of thought, such as Carlyle, Froude, and Ruskin. In *Past and Present*, Carlyle pours forth one long denunciation of woe over what he calls the 'Gospel of Mammonism.' 'With our Mammon-Gospel,' he says, 'we have come to strange conclusions; our life is not a mutual helpfulness, but rather, cloaked under due laws of war, named "competition," and so forth, it is a mutual hostility. We have profoundly forgotten everywhere that cash-payment is not the sole relation of human beings.'

Froude, the historian, puts the sum of his message to the nation in these words: 'The Protestant world has accepted a code of action from which morality has been banished, and the clergy have for the most part sat silent, and occupy themselves in carving and polishing into completeness their schemes of doctrinal salvation. They shrink from offending the wealthy members of their congregations. They withdraw into the affairs of the other world, and leave the present world to the men of business and the devil. For the working purposes of life they have allowed the Gospel to be superseded by the new formulas of political economy. This so-called science is the most

Digitized by Google

barefaced attempt that has ever yet been openly made on this earth to regulate human society without God or recognition of the moral law. The clergy have allowed it to grow up, to take possession of the air, to penetrate schools and colleges, to control the action of legislators, without even so much as opening their lips in remonstrance.' Ruskin has contended for years against the same political economy and the commercialism bred of it, and characterised the clergy of the Church of England, so long indifferent to his message, as an order of men who 'dined with the rich and preached to the poor.' Religious communities, not in the pay or under the patronage of the State, have been on the whole avowed foes of monopoly and privilege, fearless advocates of justice between class and class, faithful allies of the Christ who drove buyers and sellers out of the temple; but the spirit of commercialism has likewise intruded into these communities, and by holding among them the power of the purse, sought to make itself 'lord of God's heritage.' It is a new and formidable foe, which places them on a money basis, and may be sometimes employed to overcome the virtue even of Christ's ministers. Wealth comes to be the standard by which Ecclesiasticism, with its trafficking and trimming, with its regard for little oligarchies of moneyed men, exhibits a posturing to Mammon, at which wise men shake their heads, and righteous men burn with mingled feelings of resentment and pity and contempt. Every person is measured by the standard of wealth; Christ is sold for Mammon; policies of expediency, through its menace, are adopted, and principle is surrendered; the one is sacrificed to the many; and that Caiaphas-counsel has a lower deep still when the one is sacrificed to the money of a little knot of purse-proud men. The gold of the Church's treasury, when obtained at such a price, is bought too dear. Amos told Israel in the height of her prosperity that she would fall, because she had sold 'the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes.' Are not men, and not merchandise, the true wealth of the State? The worst thing about commercialism is that it erects money into the 'one standard of

Digitized by Google

life, which gives estimation to the vilest things that have it, and leaves in contempt the best that are without it.'[1]

That amid pæans sung to the honour of our industrial *régime*, there has been a serious loss of spiritual power to the Church is generally admitted. Much difference of opinion exists as to where the blame for this decline of spirituality should be laid. Some think it is due to doctrinal defections, some to the vagaries of criticism, some to ecclesiastical divisions; but all these together are not so much to blame as the deadening blight of commercialism. Anyone who understands the situation will acknowledge that the Church, in order to counteract and combat, must itself be saved from an influence which has left so foul a blot on many of its institutions, and done so much to paralyse its function as guardian of the spiritual interests of the people. Judgment must begin at God's house. And the first and deepest reformation of the Church must always be such an outpouring of the Holy Spirit as to give it a livelier sense of eternal realities and heavenly requirements. 'Be spiritual,' says the Head of the Church, and again He says, 'Be spiritual. Seek the baptism of fire to make thee all on fire with love of justice and holiness.' And this baptism will fit into the new want of the new time. In fresh affirmations of the spiritual, it will take shape in a holy resentment against Mammonism. The Church stands in a pre-eminent degree for the spiritual interests of the world, and it is a common calamity whenever the material interest overshadows them. 'Where no vision is, the people perish.' We need a healthy, virile, and manly idealism in religious work to call men back to higher standards of worth, and to reject with scorn such policies as would impair the Church's spirituality, and bring it under the supremacy of that 'unspiritual God, Mammon.' Were the Church as spiritually alive as it ought to be, it would quickly discern one of the most significant facts of our time—the process of transition from so-called political to social economics. The hard-and-fast formulas of the 'Manchester School' are

[1] Martineau.

Digitized by Google

breaking up everywhere before a wider regard for the welfare of society. It is the Church's duty to pour the white light of Christianity into the working of the present industrial system; it is the duty of the Church's ministers to preach to the rich, and dine with the poor, if need be. The Church's spiritual commonalty must be more emphatically asserted: it must be remembered that the toiling millions are not mere muscle-and-bone machines, to be worked till they break down, in order that a few vast fortunes may be made, but are sons and daughters of God, with inalienable moral rights which political economy can never extinguish. When the Church of Christ proclaims once more this truth with all its might it will only return to its primitive and purest testimony.

The plea for a consideration of social problems might be still further urged, since the subject is exhaustless, but enough has been said in the way of introduction.

Other factors are at work on social interests. To affirm that the Church can meet all demands is no less mistaken than to think that the Church has nothing to do with them. It ought, however, to take a firm grip of these questions, and not be so indifferent as to let them be settled outside its pale. If the Churches do not concern themselves with what concerns the people, we cannot look for the people to interest themselves in the work of the Churches. Therefore do we advocate a sympathetic attitude towards social interests, a willingness to approach them with the animation of a large and generous sentiment, and with strenuous resolve to place ourselves in the position of the people, and view their questions through their own eyes as well as by the light of Christ. Above all, let us study and master the social principles of the New Testament; let us fully preach and fearlessly practise them; let us bring quickness of understanding, loftiness of spirit, blended moderation and enthusiasm, and unflinching determination to follow the truth and do the right. Students of the Social Question are the Sons of Hope, because they have learned that what others take for seething chaos may after all be the struggle upwards to

Digitized by Google

a better order, and that the movements of our time are, many of them, nothing less than the stir of God's Spirit in the valley of dry bones. The last century was marked by a great religious revolution; this century has been marked by a great political revolution; and the next century will be marked by a great social revolution. To hasten it is to promote the Kingdom, and build the City, of God. It is the problem of the present and of the future, and to share in its travail is as profitable as it is fascinating. It is a privilege to live in the present crisis, because the prophecies of good are so great, and some of them are so near fulfilment. And, after all has been said, everyone admits that the first and only solid reform, which ensures all others, is what each man, in the Light of Christ, begins and perfects on *himself*.

Digitized by Google

II.

SMITH'S 'WEALTH OF NATIONS' AND 'THEORY OF MORAL SENTIMENTS.'

SCOTLAND is justly proud of her gifted sons, and, among the most gifted, delights to rank the author of the *Wealth of Nations* and the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Both of these works indicate the highest order of mind, and by universal consent bear the stamp of immortality. Each of them is great in its own province of thought: the ethical treatise, though unphilosophical in its treatment, has the keen analysis and literary charm of Montaigne's *Essays*; while it may be said of the other, without exaggeration, that it has created an epoch in the history of economic thought. In his *Economic Studies*, Bagehot says that 'no other form of political philosophy has ever had one-thousandth part of the influence upon us; its teachings have settled down into the common sense of the nation, and have been irreversible.'

After studying mathematics and philosophy in the University of Glasgow, and proceeding as Snell Exhibitioner to Balliol College, Oxford, he returned to his native town of Kirkcaldy, and three years afterwards was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy in Glasgow University. Seven years later, in 1759, he published his work on the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. That theory is founded on the law of Sympathy, which Smith thus defines: 'We either approve or disapprove of the conduct of another man, according as we feel that, when we bring his case home to ourselves, we either can or cannot entirely

Digitized by Google

sympathise with the sentiments and motives which directed it. And, in the same manner, we either approve or disapprove of our own conduct, according as we feel that, when we place ourselves in the situation of another man, and view it, as it were, with his eyes and from his station, we either can or cannot entirely enter into and sympathise with the sentiments and motives which influenced it.'

In 1763 he was invited to accompany the young Duke of Buccleuch on his continental travels, and for this purpose he resigned his Professorship. About three years were spent abroad, chiefly in France, at Paris and Toulouse. During a ten months' stay in Paris, he made the acquaintance of Turgot, Quesnay, Necker, D'Alembert, Helvetius, and other shining lights of the Illumination period. Having a powerful and accurate memory, he laid up all that he saw and heard among that extraordinary group of philosophers and reformers. Such men as Turgot and Quesnay must have had a peculiar fascination for him. Their love of economic research was equally great, and they burned with a like zeal for the best interests of mankind. On returning to this country, Adam Smith, rich with mental stores, buried himself for ten years in his native Kirkcaldy, from which his life-long friend, David Hume, sought in vain to allure him to the metropolis. From his house in James' Court, commanding a view of the Fife coast, Hume wrote to him in 1769: 'I propose to you to come hither, and pass some days with me in this solitude. I want to know what you have been doing, and propose to exact a rigorous account of the method in which you have employed yourself during your retreat.' Seven years later, a reason for this long retreat was given in the publication of *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Hume hailed the treatise, though doubting its immediate popularity, and spoke of its depth, solidity, and acuteness, and assured the author that as it was illustrated by so many curious facts it must at last take the public attention. In the course of fifteen years, it passed through six editions, and was translated into the principal languages of Europe.

Digitized by Google

Statesmen, like Pitt and Cobden, drew their ideas from it; slowly but surely it leavened the public mind, and with such success that, according to Buckle the historian, eighty years after its publication there is not to be found anyone of tolerable education who is not ashamed of holding opinions which, before the time of Adam Smith, were universally received.

The charm of the book consists in the lucidity of its style and the wealth of its illustrations, qualities which have obtained for it a greater influence on practical affairs than belongs to any other book of the eighteenth century. Knowledge of actual fact is the striking feature on every page, and blends so constantly with every enunciation of principle that theorists dispute whether he drew his theories from his facts, or made use of his facts to verify his theories.

It must not be supposed that no political economy existed before Adam Smith's time. He had his predecessors, as James Watt had in connection with the steam-engine; he owed much, and makes acknowledgment of it, to the Physiocrats of France, who were the first to proclaim the doctrine of Free Trade. In 1766, ten years before Smith published his treatise, Turgot wrote an essay on the 'Formation and Distribution of Wealth,' in which he anticipated some of the leading principles of the *Wealth of Nations*, such as those of the division of labour, free trade, loans and interest, and processes in the formation of capital. But Turgot's essay lacks the breadth of historic outlook and amplitude of illustration that have given so unique a place to Smith's greater work in the education of the human understanding. Smith acknowledged Quesnay's system to be the nearest approximation to the truth that had been published on the principles of economic science; and he intended to dedicate to Quesnay the *Wealth of Nations*, but was prevented by Quesnay's death.

Some men of note in this country, like Sir Dudley North, had enlightened views on economic subjects, but Smith treated them with such breadth of view, such skill in the exposure of error, such mastery in the analysis of causes, and such copious-

Digitized by Google

ness of apt detail, that political economy, as a science or art, may be said to date from the appearance of his work. While he has the merit of gathering up the best thought of those who went before, he has likewise the greater merit of anticipating the researches of those who came after him. Errors that had grown for ages, held by French economists regarding the produce of land as the main source of wealth, and by political arithmeticians of this country regarding a nation's wealth as dependent on a favourable balance of trade that had to be bolstered up with an elaborate machinery of protection,—errors such as these were shown to be false and absurd, and the great antithesis of Free Trade was stated with powerful and convincing clearness. It did not seem to him that such a tenet would ever be accepted in this country, for he tells us in the fourth book that 'to expect that the freedom of trade should ever be entirely restored in Great Britain is as absurd as to expect that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established in it. Not only the prejudices of the people, but, what is much more unconquerable, the private interests of many individuals, irresistibly oppose it.' Half a century later Peel abolished the Corn Laws, and uttered the memorable words: 'I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist, who, from less honourable motives, clamours for Protection, because it conduces to his own individual benefit; but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of goodwill in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labour and to earn their daily bread with the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened with a sense of injustice.'

Perhaps no greater achievement is recorded in history than Adam Smith won by converting the British nation to adopt Free Trade. He vindicated the doctrine on a dual basis—on considerations drawn from the advantages of division of labour, and from conceiving rightly the functions of money as the instrument of commerce and the measure of value. With

Digitized by Google

division of labour springs up a universal opulence which extends to the lowest ranks of the people. The plenty of one country may be used to relieve the scarcity of another. Money is the instrument through the medium of which goods of all kinds are bought and sold, or exchanged for one another. Wealth does not consist in money, but in what money purchases, in the abundant free exchange of commodities for commodities, of imports for exports, and *vice versâ*. 'Were all nations,' Smith writes, 'to follow the liberal system of free exportation and free importation, the different states into which a great continent was divided would so far resemble the different provinces of a great empire.' This extension of unlimited commerce shows the generous fertility of Smith's reasoning, for it is an international carrying out of the Christian principles: 'Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you. Freely ye have received, freely give.' In several chapters of the fourth book, the author exposes with ruthless skill the fallacies of the Mercantile System, the meanness of its expedients for granting bounties upon exportation, and the unreasonableness of placing restraints upon importation. On the evils of such a system he writes with strong feeling, though some authorities do not see how his views of Mercantilism could have governed England's policy during the time when her great commercial supremacy was acquired.

The question of Smith's indebtedness to his predecessors deserves a passing notice. A recent perusal of the *Inquiry* led the present writer to ask the question, and try to answer it; and with that end in view John Morley's fine sketches of men of the Illumination period were taken up as a study, but no light could be found in that quarter. An attempt was then made to obtain a sight of Smith's library, only to find that it had been divided between two of his representatives, who were willing to sell it to any public body, but there was no offer. Most of the books in the part belonging to an Edinburgh relative have been presented to the Free Church College Library; the other part is said to have been inherited by a

Digitized by Google

second relative belonging to Dublin. It is only in this year of grace that Dr. James Bonar has been entrusted by the Economic Club with the project of grouping and cataloguing Adam Smith's works. This collection is nearly completed, and when the few volumes scattered up and down the country in private hands have come in, materials will then, and only then, be in possession for writing a chapter on Smith's obligations to previous authors. His range of reading must have been enormous, and it is evident he did not think it necessary to acknowledge the sources of help, except in rare cases. We may safely affirm that there was never an epoch-making book of whose author it could not be said that he owed a great deal to his predecessors. When Greek systems are analysed, they show how little, save the combination, was Plato's own. Coleridge's borrowings, unconscious as well as conscious, from Schelling, Hamilton's obligations to Kant, Kant's to Hume, Hume's to Berkeley and Locke, prove how much every thinker, system-builder, and discoverer owes to his predecessors. Adam Smith derived much in this way, and from a habit of not acknowledging obligations it might be made to appear quite true that he has been guilty, as one of the younger school puts it, of 'deliberate, verbal, and unavowed plunder'; but such a charge would be a thousand times more unfair to Smith and the service he rendered to economical science than any unfairness which he showed to previous writers by withholding their names when he made use of their researches. This subject has never been carefully handled, and its exhaustive treatment in any forthcoming biography may hardly be worth the labour. The investigation of it has been undertaken by Professor Foxwell of Cambridge since 1875, when he first set out upon an edition of the *Wealth of Nations*, and it is understood that his collection of this particular branch of economic literature now reaches several thousand volumes, yet he does not feel satisfied that he is in a position to deal with it adequately. In a letter of reply to one of inquiry from the present writer on this subject, he may be regarded as stating his mature judgment when he says: 'There

Digitized by Google

can be no question that Smith was considerably indebted to his predecessors. I have gone so far as to challenge pupils to find a single important doctrine in the *Wealth of Nations* which had not been stated by previous writers. . . . His indebtedness to the Physiocrats is apparent in almost every chapter and in the whole method of treatment. His account of taxation is largely derived from predecessors, English and French. To Cantillon he owes whole chapters. But his illustrations, and the general plan of his work, and the mode in which he relates Economics with other liberal studies, are mainly original.' This statement of what is due by Smith to previous writers could, in all likelihood, be well substantiated, yet a much larger and finer measure of originality, we feel, ought to be accorded to such an epoch-making work as the *Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations.* Professor Marshall is less grudging in his praise when he says: 'The next great step in advance, the greatest step that economics has ever taken, was the work, not of a school, but of an individual. Whenever Adam Smith differs from his predecessors he is more nearly right than they; while there is scarcely any economic truth now known of which he did not get some glimpse.' It is interesting in a great writer to find out how much is original, and how much is derived, but that will never affect our admiration for his greatness. Genius does not so much create the new as combine the old in a new way. Witness Shakespeare as a pre-eminent instance of this truth—a great plagiarist, if you will, but shaping what he borrowed into immortal worth; and if Adam Smith used the old in like fashion, there has not been genius the less. Since he wrote there has not been an economist to rival or supersede him, not one with range of study as wide, or insight as keen, or judgment as mature, or creative method as original and far-reaching. The *Wealth of Nations* is still the most modern of books, happily combining the inductive and deductive sides of method, close still to the latest results on the laws governing the production of wealth, and truer to the state of society to-day than of his own time.

Digitized by Google

Smith promulgates liberal views with respect to labour, as we should expect from one who taught that Sympathy is the root sentiment of human nature. In the opening words of the *Wealth of Nations* he traces wealth to its original source in labour. 'The annual labour of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labour, or what is purchased with that produce from other nations.' His masterpiece abounds with evidence of his deep sympathy with the sons of toil, and of his strong desire to see them in possession of a fuller and brighter life. He wished to restore the original simplicity and freedom of nature, and expressed his confidence in the power and disposition of God to cause the individual, freely seeking his own interest, to perform a part at the same time in promoting the common weal. This recognition of a Divine Order, controlling the wills of men, though somewhat wrongly applied when he thought that the sum of individual interests would result in the good of the whole, agrees with Carlyle's teaching that the study of the nature and causes of the *Wealth of Nations* should be conceived to have as much sacredness in it as the study of any of the other revelations of the divine invisible hand working in the world of plants or animals, or of the stars of heaven. Ricardo dropped that view as an assumption, and Political Economy became for a time the dismal science. Adam Smith advocated a liberal reward of labour in the striking language that 'as it is the effect of increasing wealth, so it is the cause of increasing population. To complain of it is to lament over the necessary effect and cause of the greatest public prosperity.'

He approved the combination of workmen to secure better wages and shorter hours; and though such combinations in his day were punishable by statute, this injustice incurred his severe censure. An Act which imposed penalties on workmen for combining, while permitting masters freely to do so, could not but draw down his condemnation. He says with truth,

Digitized by Google

'We have no Acts of Parliament against combining to lower the price of work, but many against combining to raise it.'

The author of the *Wealth of Nations* did not escape from falling into errors. His defence of the Navigation Laws, and his views on the defects of Joint-Stock Enterprise, have been negatived by experience, but they do not affect the true value of his work.

A closer inquiry into this economic treatise will reveal its merits and defects. What are its fundamental positions? It lays down the position that self-interest is the chief motor in human affairs, and on this doctrine bases national wealth. No doubt, the doctrine in Smith's hand was modified by the teaching set forth in his earlier book on the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*; he contrives to unite what seems to be inconsistent —the theory of moral sentiments and the theory of individual self-interest; and Buckle justly insists that the two works should be read in connection; but the fact remains that while Sympathy is the keynote of the ethical treatise, self-interest is the keynote of the *Wealth of Nations*. In 1759 Adam Smith published his theory of virtue, and taught that the primary objects of our moral perceptions are the actions of other men, that in judging the conduct of our neighbours we come to apply these judgments to ourselves, to acquire a sense of duty, and give it paramount authority over all other principles of action. The golden rule of justice, sympathy, and benevolence is placed at the foundation of the earlier work. Seventeen years later Smith published his economic treatise, from which we can easily discern that contact with French thinkers had given a new direction to his thoughts. In his *Wealth of Nations* the theory of moral sentiments has no commanding place, does not shape speculation in any perceptible measure. Men are habitually influenced by the motive of self-interest, and, assuming that this motive would regulate their conduct and induce them under any given circumstances to act in the same way, Smith taught that every man should be allowed, so long as he observed the law of justice, to pursue his own interest in his own way.

Digitized by Google

Next, he claimed that every man should be freed from restraints of local regulation or national law. 'Natural liberty' was the Gospel of Political Economy preached by Adam Smith. He had learned that doctrine from Rousseau and the French Physiocrats, or advocates of the law of nature. They taught that there had been an original simplicity, in which all men were equal and free; that, on the formation of society, men entered into an engagement or 'social contract,' to surrender certain individual rights so as to secure the rights of others; that a growth of artificial restraints to the natural progress of trade had sprung up, and that this overgrowth must be removed in order to let the common people freely dispose of the labour of their hand. Rousseau's trim theory of man's primitive state could not be accepted in its entirety by thinkers like Adam Smith, because it cannot stand investigation scientifically, while historically it is absurd, in view of the lesson that the movement of humanity is progressive and upward. That part of it which Rousseau, as a citizen of Geneva, had unconsciously borrowed from the Reformation, was laid hold of by the Physiocrats; and Smith made admirable use of it under the name of 'natural liberty.' In the eighteenth century, the sacred and inviolable rights of men lay under the heel of customs of feudal times. Statutes of Labourers and Apprentices, fixtures of wages and prices, Assizes of bread, regulations about trade with countries to which export was restricted,—all this vexatious system, in the hands of a class of individuals whose interest was not always the same with that of the public, had to be overturned before anything like an Economic Order could be attained. To attempt the overturn was a stupendous task, but Adam Smith undertook it; and the fulcrum by which he shook it to its foundation was the doctrine of 'natural liberty.' It is a singular coincidence that the year which saw the publication of the *Wealth of Nations* heard the Declaration of American Independence, formally asserting all men to be 'by nature equal and free.' 'His passion for liberty, which illuminates all his pages, sheds its lustre over the problems of this and every age;

Digitized by Google

and it gives a permanent value as well as imparts a persuasive charm to the *Wealth of Nations*.'[1]

In the demand that law should leave the economic machine free to work by itself, Adam Smith not only expected the result to be a great increase in the production of wealth, but founded that expectation on his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. For he could not separate entirely one part of his nature from another, and his passion for freedom must have been sustained by the faith he had in the benevolent government of the world by God, that the individual exercising freedom would be led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention, and which would secure general well-being. If the play of natural liberty and self-interest leads to a right order of things, it is evident that the industry of every man will be brought into competition with others; and Smith taught that such a principle, if allowed free exercise, would prove an enormous stimulus to the forces of commercial prosperity. Competition is a law of life, without which it is impossible to ascend in the scale of intelligence, industry, or virtue. It is the command to excel, and under the name of emulation may be regarded as a noble instinct. Men are false to the law of life, false to a true impulse of the social system in which they are placed, if they do not recognise the working of competition, and obey it. Adam Smith recognised it as a potent force in the production of commerce, and in the improvement of the things produced.

The *Wealth of Nations* appeared on the eve of that extraordinary movement—the French Revolution, and its author lived to see the first act of that drama in 1789. His death occurred in the following year. What he thought of that event, we do not know. It should be remembered that the dark figures of Robespierre and Danton had not yet appeared riding in the whirlwind. Up to 1790, the best men of France hoped for a peaceful transition from the old order to the new, and the King himself had gone to the National Assembly to

[1] L. L. Price, *The Economic Journal*, June 1893.

Digitized by Google

express a single wish of attachment to the new Constitution, and of devotion to the peace and happiness of France. In such a bright and promising outlook, Adam Smith could only rejoice; and poets like Wordsworth, and statesmen like Pitt, regarded that downfall of privilege as big with all the hopes of men. It denoted a triumph for the Gospel of 'Man's natural rights' preached by Jean Jacques Rousseau, and repeated by Smith in his doctrine of 'natural liberty.' With the incapacity and blindness of subsequent actors in that revolutionary drama he could have no sympathy, but with the pith of the movement as a social and economic transformation he could not but agree. As a movement for rescuing the tiller of the soil, and sweeping away odious burdens that crushed the prosperity of a thrifty and industrious people, he saw a nation rising up in its might to adopt those economic reforms which he had elaborated in his great treatise. How far he dreaded it as disturbing the natural course of things, and introducing changes to a generation not sufficiently tenacious of justice and tender of property, we may infer from what he says about the necessity of restoring the freedom of trade with a good deal of reserve and circumspection. 'The equitable regard to interest requires that changes of this kind should never be introduced suddenly, but slowly, gradually, and after long warning.'

But he stood unconsciously on the threshold of a greater revolution than that which brought liberty, but without justice, to France, and therefore embarked it on a sea of troubles. It was the Industrial Revolution which came about during the next half century in his own land, and which rapidly advanced with the invention of the steam-engine and labour-saving machinery. Amid enormous blessings which that Industrial Revolution conferred on this country, there was at the same time a separation of liberty from justice, and an abuse of liberty in consequence, which led to a series of disorders and cruelties that only find a parallel in the French Revolution and its shameful iniquities. Freedom was the chief talisman of both movements, but the claim of the individual to make his passions,

Digitized by Google

aspirations, and convictions the final and decisive law is a claim full of danger, and, in connection with both these events, it was shown to be so in a lamentable degree. Freedom is the indispensable condition of the best of all, but it cannot lead men until the spirit of Truth, which means science in the intellectual order and justice in the social order, has joined company with it. The author of the *Wealth of Nations* is not answerable for any such outcome of things. For his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* was a standing protest against the abuses to which the doctrines of natural liberty, self-interest, and competition were carried, while in the defence of liberty he always sought to vindicate the rights of the weak against the oppression of the strong. If he was not sagacious enough to permeate his economic treatise with the moral sentiments of the other, and thus anticipate the perversions of his followers, it is only saying that he had not the gift of prophecy, and that he was not endowed with a supernatural power of insight. One problem he set before him, and it was a great one, even to make nations prosper, to break the fetters of artificial and oppressive restriction, and to teach economic laws that promote the growth of wealth. He took in hand a magnificent problem, and furnished us with the key to solve it. Free trade, free labour, and free contract are the laws which he first formulated in this country, and the recognition of which has so largely contributed to the increase of material prosperity. He believed in a beneficent government of the world, and held that the free play of competition between man and man in the end served the purpose of the whole community, 'because the individual actions of men were regulated without their will by a higher power.' He shared largely in the optimistic dreams of Rousseau and Diderot, that his theory of moral sentiments would come more and more into practice. This optimism led him to think that the play of personal interests would ultimately secure the common weal, and establish a true order of justice and goodwill among men.

We are able to estimate very clearly the chief merit of his treatise on the *Wealth of Nations*. It laid down in a broad,

Digitized by Google

liberal, and unstereotyped form, the laws for the production of wealth, and did more than any other book in the English language to increase our national resources. To its luminous treatment of the laws of production we owe that rapid accumulation of wealth which has raised the standard of comfort among all classes of the community, and enabled Great Britain to carry the blessings of civilisation into all lands. The paramount need of his time was to expound those laws, and he did so in a way that left nothing to his successors but to stereotype into hard formulæ what he taught in a genial and humane spirit.

The question of the distribution of wealth is the task laid on this generation of economic thinkers, and it is a still more delicate and difficult one than that pertaining to production. A writer of original and independent ability is wanted to do in the end of the nineteenth century what Adam Smith did in the end of the eighteenth, to work out into luminous distinctness the laws of the Distribution, as he wrote out the laws of the Production of Wealth. The new architect will find the materials lying around him in an abundance which it will tax the utmost capacity to arrange into a great harmonious whole. No man could fulfil the task with greater skill and thoroughness than the Father of Political Economy, could he but rise from the dead. For he had the humanitarian, no less than the intellectual, qualifications which are necessary for the work. Above all, he has fashioned the instrument, and furnished the dynamic, which, if applied with ethical vigour, might effect another Industrial Revolution, and carry forward to a higher stage of fulfilment, the angel's song of 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and goodwill to men.' I refer to his wonderful treatise, the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, with its grand keynote of Sympathy. Touching those primary objects which nature had recommended to us as eligible, he observes there: 'Nature, too, had taught us, that as the prosperity of two was preferable to that of one, that of many, or of all, must be infinitely more so. That we ourselves were but one, and that, consequently, wherever our prosperity was in-

Digitized by Google

consistent with that, either of the whole or of any considerable part of the whole, it ought, even in our own choice, to yield to what was so vastly preferable.' Such sentiments as these lay the basis of a true system of Economics. Could the author of the *Wealth of Nations* and the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* return to supply the paramount need of our time, he might need to do little more than fuse his two books—the Economical and the Moral—into one great treatise, in order to provide a Novum Organon for solving the urgent problem of an equitable Diffusion of Wealth.

In such labours, and with such hopes, men like Adam Smith have employed their talents. And he who would help the cause of human well-being must fortify his spirit with such outlook as cheered Condorcet in closing his Sketch of Human Progress: 'How this picture of the human race, freed from all its fetters, withdrawn from the empire of chance, as from that of the enemies of progress, and walking with firm and assured step in the path of truth, of virtue, and happiness, presents to the philosopher a sight that consoles him for the errors, the crimes, the injustice, with which the earth is yet stained, and of which he is not seldom the victim! It is in the contemplation of this picture that he receives the reward of his efforts for the progress of reason, for the defence of liberty. He ventures to link them with the sacred chains of the destinies of man: it is there he finds the true recompense of virtue, the pleasure of having done a lasting good; fate can no longer undo it by any disastrous compensation that shall restore prejudice and bondage. This contemplation is for him a refuge, into which the recollection of his persecutors can never follow him, in which, living in thought with man reinstated in the rights and dignities of his nature, he forgets man tormented and corrupted by greed, by base fear, by envy; it is here that he truly abides with his fellows in an elysium that his reason has known how to create for itself, and that his love for humanity adorns with all purest delights.'

Digitized by Google

III.

POLITICAL ECONOMY—OLD AND NEW.

SEVEN years before Adam Smith published the *Wealth of Nations* James Watt took out a patent for the steam-engine; a year later James Hargreaves patented the spinning-jenny; and a few years later still, in 1779, Samuel Crompton invented the 'mule,' a machine which combined the advantages of the jenny and Arkwright's water-frame,—thus getting its name,—and which effected such an increase of productive power that by 1811 no fewer than 4½ million spindles were worked by it in our factories. These inventions accelerated a Revolution which had been silently proceeding before they came out, which called into operation economical and industrial forces that have transformed the face of the country, and led to unparalleled developments of wealth. In consequence of these new forces, many of Smith's economical speculations were entirely nullified. He dwells on the disadvantages of distance for trading purposes, and prefers the home trade to the Continental, and the Continental trade to the American, on account of quicker returns; but steam has well-nigh annihilated distance both by sea and land, and has brought New York as near to Liverpool as Paris was to London a century ago. He consoled home farmers by assuring them that fat cattle could not be imported, even from Ireland, in any numbers, and that corn was too bulky an article to be brought into Great Britain in large quantities. Yet both are now freely imported, and two-thirds of our wheat

Digitized by Google

comes from abroad. He states that the population of our island had not been doubled in less than five hundred years, and yet it was trebled in the hundred years succeeding 1780. Such an increase did not seem to be possible at the time when he wrote. It was principally, however, in connection with the textile industries that the greatest changes of a social and economic kind took place. For centuries this island was a purely agricultural country, growing large quantities of wool, exporting it to Flanders as raw material, and importing manufactured goods and luxuries in exchange. Nine-tenths of English wool kept in activity the looms of Bruges and Ghent, and a stoppage of this export from our shores used to throw half the Flemish towns out of work. From the wool-tax alone, as far back as 1340, Edward III. drew a revenue of £138,000. A certain amount of this article was at an early period turned to account at home in the manufacture of coarse cloths, and fine cloths such as linen came from Liége and Flanders, velvet and silk goods from Venice and Genoa; but in the end of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, through the immigration of Flemish and Huguenot refugees, home manufactures had developed so extensively that the whir of looms could be heard through the land, and the cloth trade took its place among our chief industries in such centres as Norfolk and Suffolk, Kent and Devonshire, and counties south of the Trent. About 1776, the year when Adam Smith published his *Inquiry*, we approach a new period in the development of textile industries—a period in which machinery begins to supersede manual labour. In Smith's time these industries were widely distributed over the country; the spinning-wheel was to be found in every cottage, and the wool was turned into yarn by wife and daughter, while the yarn was woven into cloth by father and son. Besides the products of the loom, the cottager had other ways and means. He had a plot of ground about his cottage, and could relieve the monotony of the loom by growing his own vegetables, or feeding his pigs and poultry; and, as the commons were still unenclosed, he had a right to turn his cow upon the adjoining

Digitized by Google

pasture. It was an idyllic existence over which the historian loves to linger. Defoe pictures it in his *Tour through Great Britain* in 1724–26: 'The land was divided into small enclosures from two acres to six or seven each, seldom more, every three or four pieces of land having a house belonging to them; hardly a house standing out of speaking distance from another. We could see at every house a tenter, and on almost every tenter a piece of cloth or kersey or shalloon. At every considerable house there was a manufactory. Every clothier keeps one horse at least, to carry his manufactures to the market; and every one generally keeps a cow or two more for his family. By this means the small pieces of enclosed land about each house are occupied, for they scarce sow corn enough to feed their poultry. The houses are full of lusty fellows, some at the dye vat, some at the looms, others dressing the cloths; the women and children carding or spinning, being all employed from the youngest to the oldest.' Take another picture of that time in the rural capital of Lauderdale, whose burghal arrangements are of a very primitive kind. In 1772 the burgesses were restricted to the right of pasturing eighteen sheep, also a cow and a horse on the common, about 1700 acres in extent. Cows and horses were turned out to graze during the day, and were brought home at night. A cowherd went along the street blowing a horn, at the sound of which every cow was turned out to join the herd, which increased in numbers at every turn.[1]

All that life of 'contentment spinning at the cottage door' was destined to pass away in the next half century under the operations of steam power and the new inventions, when the furnace and the factory rose up to replace the domestic system of industry. Many small master manufacturers had already begun to produce on a large scale, and before the eighteenth century was out it was common to see mills placed by the side of streams for the sake of having water-power; but soon after the power of steam was applied to machinery, and Cartwright's power-loom came into use, the old form of industry was doomed,

[1] *Border Church Life*, by James Tait.

Digitized by Google

and the cottager, seeing himself hopelessly beaten by the 'jenny' and the 'mule,' and unable to eke out a livelihood by keeping a cow, had to go himself, or send his sons and daughters, into the new steam-factories. The rise of these mammoth workshops caused a variety of social and industrial changes. As they became located in the North of England, a great shifting of population to Lancashire and Yorkshire, Durham and Northumberland, was the result. The villages of these northern counties shot up into great towns. At the same time, an increase of population led to the enclosure of commons and waste lands. This encroachment of landlords on the common lands went on all through the eighteenth century, but the process, which helped to extinguish the yeomanry, was greatly accelerated from 1760 to 1843, during which period the number of acres enclosed rose to 7 millions.

To this industrial revolution we owe the development of the great middle class, of the powerful system of Capital, and of an unexampled accumulation of wealth. The trade of the country advanced by leaps and bounds, inasmuch as India and our American colonies opened to us unlimited markets, and our conquests by sea and land secured for us 'the universal empire of a sole market.' Owing to these advantages we had a clear start of half a century in the race of commercial enterprise over the other nations of Europe, while the powers of production obtained by the new inventions enabled us largely to supply the demands made upon our industry.

If we study the economic outcome of this Industrial Order, we shall come nearer to the subject before us. It led to an enormous aggregation of wealth, and generated a potent influence alike in the local and the political sphere. The mill-owner, the ironmaster, and the great merchant were the conspicuous figures of the system; into their hands came large accumulations of wealth, which made them magnates of such importance that they could control the markets of the world, appear in their several neighbourhoods as rivals of the proud landowners, and sit side by side with them in the senate of the

Digitized by Google

nation. In this new order Industry was placed on a capitalistic basis, and Capital was invested with a large and ever-increasing ascendency over Labour. In the old domestic system the workmen were economically independent, stood more on a level with the masters, and enjoyed a more equal participation in the profits of labour. Under the Capitalistic system these features are sufficiently reversed to strike the most common observer, and give point to the words of one of our younger economists: 'What we say is that since the old Political Economy was written, a new force has come into the world that has made much of the competition of business life not free as between man and man—that is, the enormous and accumulative power of large capitals. Poverty is the heavy handicap of the worker; but in any fair or free game, where competition benefits both sides as it should, it is never the weaker side that carries the handicap.'

Another outcome of the Industrial Period was the exploitation of Labour, with its concomitant evils. At the beginning the people spun and wove in their cottages, widely scattered over the country, and passed a healthy contented life, all redolent of the soil; fifty years after they were herded together round mammoth workshops, inside of whose close atmosphere they were obliged to work for twelve or fourteen hours, and then to seek repose in ill-constructed, badly-drained, and overcrowded dwellings. The laws of sanitation were unknown, and wretched hovels were common in rapidly-growing centres of population; as a consequence, the toilers, young and old, died in terrible numbers, swept off by contagious fevers. Under the 'Apprentice System' the first and most awful horrors of the exploitation of Labour were enacted. Factory owners bargained with parish authorities for pauper children, as young as five years old, who were bound apprentices until twenty-one years of age; and to get rid of the idiots, one was taken by the mill-owner with twenty sane children. What became of the idiots remains a secret, but history tells a harrowing tale of the apprentices. They were taken to Lancashire in barges from London work-

Digitized by Google

houses, or packed in waggons and sent a four days' journey to Nottingham; they were housed in barracks, from which there was no escape, and fed on the coarsest fare. As for their work, let the author of *The History of the Factory Movement* be heard: 'In stench, in heated rooms, amid the constant whirling of a thousand wheels, little fingers and little feet were kept in ceaseless action, forced into unnatural activity by blows from the heavy hands and feet of the merciless overlooker, and the infliction of bodily pain by instruments of punishment invented by the sharpened ingenuity of insatiable selfishness.'

After this iniquity was swept away in 1802, and when water-power gave place to steam, mills were erected in densely-populated districts, and the 'ingenuity of insatiable selfishness' sharpened its wits once more to command cheap labour. New machinery enabled it to supersede the labour of men by that of women and children, and in course of time a system of long and cruel toil grew up, speaking of which in 1833 the poet Southey writes: 'The slave trade is mercy compared to it.' The Earl of Shaftesbury, then Lord Ashley, championed the cause of the mill hands in the House of Commons, and for fourteen years advocated the movement for a Ten Hours Day, in the midst of obloquy and indifference from every side. Men of the world voted him a bore; the Free Traders opposed him, tooth and nail, as an aristocrat—John Bright going so far in his denunciation of the Ten Hours Bill as to declare it to be 'one of the worst measures ever passed, in the shape of an Act of the Legislature'; the political economists sneered at him as an emotional philanthropist; and, saddest of all, the clergy stood afar off, 'great worshippers of wealth and power.' 'To whom,' he asked in the thick of the fight, 'should I have naturally looked for the chief aid? Why, undoubtedly, to the clergy, and especially those of the trading districts. Quite the reverse; from them I received no support, or next to none.' While he went on startling the House of Commons and the country with his revelations of the state of labour, Carlyle was wielding a sharp and mighty pen in the same cause. He wrote

Digitized by Google

in angry scorn of the Cash-nexus and the Gospel of Mammon. 'What is to become of our invaluable cotton trade?' cried certain spinners. The Humanity of England answered steadfastly: 'Deliver me these rickety, perishing souls of infants, and let your cotton trade take its chance.'

Following in this way the historical and inductive method of inquiry, we are better able to mark the working of economic forces, and point out the differences between the old school and the new school of economists. For Ricardo, living in the earlier years of the competitive system, developed Adam Smith's principles of Political Economy, and, assuming the universal prevalence of competition, deduced certain conclusions of an abstract, and supposed to be invariable, order. Ricardo and his school proceeded by deduction from certain postulates, without bringing their theories to the test of patient induction and verifying fact. By the use of rigorous and infallible logic, the human element was successfully eliminated and the economic man was formulated into a complete conception. Adherents of this orthodox school were accustomed to speak of their economic formulæ as if they were laws of nature. Man was regarded as a constant quantity, an unchangeable factor pursuing at all times and in all circumstances his individual interests, which no man knows better than he. 'Let the State keep its hands off, and give him unrestricted freedom; let competition have its perfect work, and each man's interest will be each man's best guide, and for the good of all. The Legislature ought not to trouble itself with the distribution of wealth, it will take place conformably to natural laws.' So they taught with great authority. A simple phrase uttered by Gournay in the last century—*Laissez faire*—sums up the whole doctrine of the Smith-Ricardo school. But that school carried economic theory too far. Orthodoxy in economics, just as in theology, has erred by failing to recognise the human; by making one-sided, rigid, and absolute, what is manifold, elastic, and variable, according to different types of society and social evolution. The concept of an 'economic man,' persistently pursuing his own pecuniary

Digitized by Google

gain, though a common enough sight, and as pitiable as it is common, when made a universal, turns out — and to the credit of human nature let it be said—turns out to be a barren fiction. For it excludes the action of many other motives which influence conduct, and parts man and society in an arbitrary way from other aspects in which they ought to be regarded. A thousand contingent facts, due to man's free will and determining social phenomena, need to be taken into account. When such considerations are weighed, it appears at once that Political Economy has no set of facts which man cannot control or alter, and which are, therefore, in no way like those to be found in the physical world. We submit to cosmical laws, but make social laws. Historical and inductive methods should be employed to test and correct deductive reasonings. Statistical inquiries, like those of Giffen or Charles Booth, are worth acres of dissertation on measure of supply. 'If we wish'—to use a well-known saying of Richard Jones—'to make ourselves acquainted with the economy and arrangements by which the different nations of the world produce and distribute their revenue, I really know but of one way to attain our object, and that is to look and see.'

In 1848 John Stuart Mill published his great work, entitled *Principles of Political Economy, with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*, and it marks a period of transition from the hard and dry doctrine of the 'dismal science' to a time when competitive industry should be modified or superseded by some better Order. 'The Social Problem of the future would be how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe and an equal participation of all the benefits of combined labour.' He claimed to be the first to distinguish between the laws of the production and the laws of the distribution of wealth, and held that the latter could be secured by particular social arrangements. The distinction which he made indicates the respective merits of the old and the new political economy. It was the merit of the old school to work out the laws of

Digitized by Google

the production of wealth; it is not the merit, but the task of the new school to work out the laws of the distribution of wealth. What Diderot wrote in the French Encyclopædia is still the problem before us: 'The net profit of a society, if equally distributed, may be preferable to a larger profit, if it be distributed unequally, and have the effect of dividing the people into two classes—one gorged with riches, the other perishing in misery.' The truest patriotism is to recognise that the greatness of a nation does not consist in the number of its great proprietors, in the wealth of its great capitalists, in the splendour of its great mansions, but in the absence of poverty from among its people, in the education of its masses, in the health of its dwellings, and in a universal enjoyment of the means of life.

It has been the fault of English economists to treat of the manner in which wealth is produced, and neglect consideration of the process by which it may be diffused. And the fault still cleaves to them. Associating with the opulent, they are tempted to play the part of 'chaplains of the middle classes,' when they should fulfil the mission of prophets, and say plainly to men of wealth that wealth, having made men unequal and given the battle to the strong, should think more of its duties than of its rights, and should give bright illustration of the Christian principle that the strong help the weak. No better use of what they have inherited could be made than that of trying to make people happy, not simply by patronage and charity, but by wise and equitable laws of distribution.

The new economy is dissatisfied with the old and its results, as demonstrated by the enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of comparatively few people, and by the perilous degree of power which it gives capital to control the interests of labour. It examines the old economic data, and tries to show that every one of them needs rigid modification; that their concurrent activity accentuates unequal conditions; and that new forces must be introduced in order to secure general well-being.

Take the doctrine of 'natural liberty' which Adam Smith taught, and his followers have emphasised. It was borrowed

Digitized by Google

from Rousseau, who descanted on human rights in a 'state of nature' as if he had lived there and knew all about it. Since his time, science has been there and told us that in the primitive state of nature, might is right—the right of the big saurian to eat up the small fry—the right of the lion, the fox, and the cuckoo—the right of the savage, the prize-fighter, and the pickpocket. Civil society is man's highest estate, and outside of it, if that were possible, he would no more be a man than a hand would be a hand without a body. It is to organised life, not to some naked state of nature, that every man owes the inalienable rights of life, freedom, equality, property, and happiness; and the only limit to those rights comes from a regard for the public good. Liberty must, therefore, be restrained when it interferes with the rights of others and makes free contract impossible. The old economy has not provided any such safeguard; and the Industrial *régime*, under its direction, has put the workman's liberty in peril. A great lout has no right to spread himself over one side of a railway carriage, and deprive others of their due; nor has a keen grasping trader any right to place his interests above those of everybody else. John Locke says 'that which has the *power* to operate is that alone which is free.' A man who must toil ten or even fifteen hours a day as a mere unit in a vast system of 'hands,' is not free. A man who sees his wife and children starving because he can get no work, is not free. A man who must be at the beck of a master, and do as he is bid or lose his situation, is not free. A man who must work on Sunday, though it be contrary alike to the law of nature and of Scripture, or be dismissed on the first convenient excuse, is not free. All that is slavery, whether it be black or white. Under the present Individualistic and Capitalistic system certain people have too much liberty, and many more people have too little liberty.

Take the doctrine of self-interest. Doubtless that is a powerful motive, and one that has been allowed the freest exercise under the old teaching that set it forth as enlightened selfishness. But 'the mere conflict of private interests,' says

Digitized by Google

Dr. Ingram in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* of 1886, 'will never produce a well-ordered commonwealth of labour.' And to the credit of human nature let it be said that such a motive, when seen in its workings, not only of huge Capitalistic greed, but of any kind of stingy behaviour under the sun, evokes the widest censure. Man is a social being, and out of the social instinct have sprung the family, the municipality, the nation. In its finest chapters history records glorious deeds of personal good, and even life itself, sacrificed for country, for truth, and for God. It is a mistake to suppose that man acts solely from self-interest, and the mistake is culpable that enunciates it as the only rule of business and the only motive of action. Unrestrained self-interest generates antagonism, not harmony, and must therefore be opposed to the common weal.

Take the doctrine of competition. No doubt it is a law of life, and a principal force in producing the means of life. But there is a false competition as well as true, and the shadow of the false lies deep on our modern Industrialism. This elbowing of Labour by Capital out of a fair share of the profits is an ugly business, for which the new economy has been compelled to seek redress. Competition in full swing lets the strong take advantage of the weak, lets each man snatch the bread out of his neighbour's mouth, and hurries contending parties to a common fate. Unfettered competition has been happily called 'administrative nihilism.' On the other hand, true competition subordinates personal to general welfare, is synonymous with emulation in good work, and brings the highest qualities of our nature into play. The struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest, may be laws of progress for the brute, but the laws of self-sacrifice and helping the unfit to live are the laws of progress for men. The sum total of these three factors has not secured a harmony of interests, or promoted public happiness. Instead of liberty broadening down among the people, we see the instruments of production locked up in hands that render the freedom of labour, and the freedom of contract, almost null and void; instead of the free action of

Digitized by Google

personal interests ushering in the common good, we see them leading to the commission of deeds of insatiable cupidity; instead of unfettered competition regulating matters into a harmonious and happy commonwealth, we see the spectacle of two nations carrying on an industrial war that is disastrous not only to the immediate combatants, but to the whole community.

The exercise of natural liberty and free competition developed an Individualism often so indifferent to the rights of Labour that it had to be held in check by the State; and as early as 1802 it called forth the action of the Legislature, and Factory Act after Factory Act was passed in the face of the stoutest resistance on the part of the economists and mill-owners. The history of legislation in England has been one long record of attempts to protect the workers from the rapacity of Capitalistic oppressors. Notwithstanding such efforts, the evils of *laissez faire* are still among us in the scramble for gold, in the struggle for a livelihood, in the present state of society with its palaces and slums, its millionaires and paupers. Professor Marshall of Cambridge has published his first volume on *Principles of Economics*, a work that may be regarded as a capitulation of the old doctrines of Political Economy, which paid almost exclusive attention to motives of individual action, to those economics which find a great and growing concern in motives connected with the collective ownership of property and the collective pursuit of important aims. 'Is, then, wealth everything, and man nothing?' asks Sismondi. 'Cotton everything, man nothing!' cried Lord Ashley, in a weary pause of the battle with the cotton magnates. But the increasing importance of man in economic study is the dominant note of Professor Marshall's work. The new economists recognise that, however important a factor supply and demand may be, men are something more, and of more concern than bales of cotton and tons of coal—that they have intellects, feelings, wills, consciences, not therefore to be employed as machines for making wealth, but as immortal beings for whom all wealth exists. The new economy is asking once more the greatest of all questions:

Digitized by Google

'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' Or, in other words: 'Are the true aims and ends of life to be lost in a treadmill round of endeavour to gain and hoard the means of life?' It is a hopeful feature of recent study that it does not regard wealth alone, but the men who make it as the chief factor; that it does not affirm property to be the sum of wealth; that health and capacity have an economic value; that best returns are not always in hard cash, and that the highest economic problems cannot be solved without reference to duty and the well-being of society.

Assuming that a more equal distribution of wealth is to be desired, Professor Marshall states a few questions as of special urgency now in our country: 'How far should an increase in the income of the poorer classes and a diminution of their work be aimed at, even if it involved some lessening of national material wealth? What are the proper relations of individual and collective action in a stage of civilisation such as ours? What business affairs should be undertaken by society itself acting through its Government, imperial or local? How far should it allow individuals and corporations to conduct their own affairs as they please? How far should it regulate the management of railways and other concerns which are to some extent in a position of monopoly, and again of land and other things the quantity of which cannot be increased by man? Is it necessary to retain in their full force all the existing rights of property, or have the original necessities for which they were meant to provide, in some measure passed away? Are the prevailing methods of using wealth entirely justifiable?'

The newer teaching affirms that economics must be an ethical science, that the sources of its inspiration should be found in the moral and spiritual nature of man, and that a more humane and genial spirit should replace the old dryness and hardness of 'the dismal science.' For the first half of this century, which increased the wealth of the nation tenfold, political economy may be said to have supplanted ethics, and few there were among the nation's teachers who dared to peep as the supplant-

Digitized by Google

ing process went forward. The clergy left poor bleeding humanity to Lord Shaftesbury, or preached an individualistic Gospel about saving one's soul to the poor on Sunday, and then went on Monday to dine with the captains of industry, those giants of Individualism in their day. But men like Carlyle, Ruskin, and Browning dealt heavy blows to the *laissez faire* theory then in the ascendant; and though they were for a while as voices crying in the wilderness, they succeeded at last in showing the nation something of the greatness of the moral world, and in charging home the urgency of social duties till the correctest Levite that passed by felt ashamed to ask what was so obvious, 'Am I my brother's keeper?' These writers laid stress on the worth of the moral life of man; and if they did not develop the organic view of humanity as seen in the course of history, such a service has been, and continues to be, rendered by the writings of Comte. With him the sympathetic and altruistic sentiments, and not the individual, are the main factors in achieving a perfect economic and social order. It is his distinction to point out an ordered movement of growth in society analogous to that of a physical organism. This fertile idea is enunciated in the parallel between the biological and sociological sciences, traced by Herbert Spencer and recent students. Instead of supporting the individualistic and competitive system by arguments derived from the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, science now points us to the close correspondence which subsists between the most highly-developed animals and a highly-developed society. Nowhere does this view make itself more felt than in the field of social adjustment and economic method. The closer, more multiplied and permanent the relations of one part with others in an organism, the more perfect is that individual part in itself. The formula is equally valid when the organism is a society and the part a man. To the individual the organic owes its content, while the more completely the individual subordinates himself to the life of the whole, the more nearly does he approach to ideal perfection.

Political Economy is, therefore, becoming moralised. Ameri-

Digitized by Google

can, no less than British, thought is greatly affected by Comtist philosophy, and recognises more frankly that 'there is within man an ethical feeling, which has grown up as a result of intuition, combined with historical experiences, and which has been clarified by religion, telling us that in our economic life as well as elsewhere we must seek to promote the welfare of our neighbour and brother.'

The word of the New Economy is not so much Wealth as Labour, and wealth as the means of its intellectual, moral, and social improvement. The Old Economy sought to codify the laws of getting rich, and lost sight of the ends of life in accumulating the means; and under its auspices the spirit of avarice sacrificed the claims of humanity to the getting of wealth. There is now wealth in plenty, and the question arises, 'What are rich people going to do with the wealth piled up out of the toil of the millions?' And the best writers on the Political Economy of the future are beginning to say that wealth is a *trust* to be used in ameliorating the condition of the people and employing labour in the interests of the workmen. Instead of Capital entrenching itself, a monopolised and privileged caste, behind the rampart of the sacred rights of property, it is called upon by the new teaching to know its duties and find its true vocation in fulfilling the Christian precept, 'He that will be greatest among you, let him be your servant.' The best spirit of the age is saturated with new teachings in politics, larger conceptions of national life, and higher standards of social duty. A higher ideal of life for all men rises up before us than that of being first in the race for riches, and it warns that a wide spread of health, leisure, comfort, culture, is infinitely more desirable than a breathless struggle for existence, a furious trampling down of the weak by the strong, and an accumulation of huge fortunes out of the toil of others. Part of that ideal consists in securing for labour a higher standard of efficiency, and comfort, and elevation to a free, independent, and dignified life. Since the New Economy sets this ideal before us, it has something to say

Digitized by Google

on the way of reaching it. The wear and tear of body and mind in past conditions of labour has led to a low standard of living; a certain amount of leisure is, therefore, required to increase the efficiency of the workers. The working day should be shortened, because mechanical toils tend to stupefy. An eight-hours day is an ideal condition of labour, and approves itself to any one free from the bias of self-interest. Who will contend that eight hours' work a day is not enough for any man or woman, whether in the factory, in the mine, or in the workshop? A horse can barely work eight hours a day, and how much better is a man than a horse? It used to be said in the fierce days of Factory legislation that the last hour gave the masters their profit, but they have now learnt that it was the last hour that ate up the profit, because long hours impair the efficiency of labour. The effect of an eight-hours day is likely to have the same effect as that of a ten-hours day.

The New Economy looks with favour on all associated and co-operative movements for the distribution of wealth. The union of collective energy with the encouragement of individual freedom is the problem to which in the future its face will be turned. All forms of collective action for a common, social good have for it a commanding attraction. Professor Marshall says: 'We are gradually moving towards forms of Collectivism which will be higher than the old because they will be based upon strong, self-disciplined individuality.' Such forms are much needed to bridge over the 'great gulf fixed' between Capital and Labour. It is desirable that happier relations should subsist between these two factors of our industrial supremacy, for they are so completely dependent on one another, and national well-being depends on their honourable working relations. Profit-sharing has been offered as a solution of the economic problem. It proposes to bring employer and employed into closer alliance by sharing gains and sharing responsibilities on more equal terms than at present. Such a plan hits a blot of the Capitalistic system, which renders it almost impossible for the wage-earner at present to become a capitalist. It would

Digitized by Google

do away with that monopoly of capital by one class of persons, which is said to be opposed to the highest standard of common happiness. It would blunt the edge of the argument that those huge accumulations of capital piled up in our land belong to those by whom it has been produced; and it would so far bring the whole nation of workers into a common enjoyment of the fruits of their labour. The excellence of this principle may be illustrated by what a Leeds mill-owner once said to Robert Owen: 'If my people were to use care with their work and avoid waste they might save me £4000 a year.' Mr. Owen said: 'Why not give them £2000 and they would do it, and you would be £2000 richer.' Capital, labour, and enterprise ought to work together in the most complete harmony, and without resort to the costly and suicidal policy of strikes and lockouts. To secure the one and avert the other, some method of dividing the profits should be tried. A distinct arrangement might be made, after a fixed profit on either side, for automatically dividing between Capital and Labour the balance equally or in certain proportions. The world of industry would go more smoothly if such equitable divisions were made, and if both parties looked not each on their own things, but on the things of others, and learned to mix a little ethics with their economics.

As it is the work of the New Economy to put a check on the mischiefs of unrestrained competition, and to moderate the pressure of the strong upon the weak, it recognises the value of trade organisations in obtaining better terms from Capital. The right to combine has been conceded, and combination has become an important social and industrial force. It has an army of workers about two millions strong, which has done great things for labour; and when the other millions of workers are equally organised, there is scarcely any demand, founded in reason and justice, which could long be denied to such a body. The State also, as the supreme instrument of law and justice, has stepped in to regulate the industrial *régime* and promote collective ownership of property. It is too late in the day to discuss the rights of the State in this matter. The Statute-Book

Digitized by Google

bears evidence in the Truck Act, the Mines Act, and the elaborate code of Factory legislation, from 1802 till 1847, that the 'let alone' policy has never been strictly observed; while the undertaking of such departments as the Post-Office and Telegraph demonstrates the fitness of the State to promote objects of general utility. Modern legislation will as certainly encourage the distribution of property as the laws of our forefathers encouraged its concentration. How far it may be the duty of the Legislature to organise industry in the interest of all its members, will be a moot point for some time to come, but that it will be called upon by the millions, who are now our masters, to help equality of opportunity in making a livelihood is a course of things as sure as the circle of the sun. Some, indeed, anticipate new and greater developments in forms of collective action for the public good, and think that the State may, in course of time, take the entire capital of the country from its present owners, at its own valuation, and convert it into national property. Arnold Toynbee, who made the moral and practical improvement of society the end of his economic studies, felt this momentum of forces so powerfully that he said: 'The era of free trade and free contract is gone, and the era of administration is to come.'

Some will think, 'After this, the deluge,' but the new Political Economy is full of hope, and 'looks for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' In this hope of a worthy economic *régime* the Church is called to share, and ought to regard its Gospel as the chief organ for fulfilling this exalted service. The sin of the Church has been to care more for distributing charity than for distributing wealth, in subordination to 'the kingdom of God and His righteousness.' Charity is good, but far better is the justice which quenches the need of it. The Church must awake to the grandeur of its task in seeking to adjust the industrial world to moral harmony, and in using its best energies to secure among men that reign of righteousness and that kingdom of heaven upon earth 'of which Plato caught a glimpse, and which the prophets of Israel and Jesus have announced to the world.'

Digitized by Google

IV.

THE LAND QUESTION—LANDLORDISM.

SCRIPTURE says that 'the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,' and means us to understand by such a statement that the land has not been made by man, neither can it be increased by him any more than air or sunshine. It is a poet's glance into the heart of the chief question of the day, into the source of those natural rights of man which are older and higher than all human laws. All things are of God; He has created the earth, and all that is in it; He, and He only, is absolute Proprietor. All things are of Him, that He may give them to the creature made in His likeness. It is His clear design that the prime necessaries of life should be freely within the reach of all His human creatures for their convenience. Every man is justly entitled to the use of the natural elements, without which a livelihood cannot be obtained, and to the full enjoyment of the fruits of his labour. He has an equal and inalienable right to some foothold on the soil, to a permament home in the land of his birth. He may claim this right, subject only to the equal rights of others. The right, then, of the community in the soil is and must be, from the nature of the case, prior to and above any private right. It was never intended that any person, or class of persons, should acquire rights against the interests of the people. All primitive communities have recognised a common right to the soil, and all the original families of the earth seem to have acted upon this principle.

Digitized by Google

'There are no traces,' according to Paley, 'of property in land in Cæsar's account of Britain; little of it in the history of the Jewish patriarchs; none of it among the nations of North America; the Scythians are expressly said to have appropriated their houses and cattle, but to have left their land in common.' A rude, barbaric sense of equity seems to have prevailed from the first that every human being should have direct access to the soil, and is by Nature entitled to some fractional share of the liferent of the earth, that is, of property in it.

While it is admitted that land was, and still is, common property among barbarous tribes, the admission may yet be no argument against private ownership of land, but for it. Where agriculture is unknown, and population is kept down by wars, and the garments of civilisation have not been put on, land remains unappropriated; but as soon as these conditions are reached in the progress of society, its appropriation has taken place. What suits the barbarous and nomadic state cannot be regarded as a criterion of settled and civilised society. Does it not seem to be a law that when nations advance, they accept private ownership in land, and that they advance in the arts of life by means of this arrangement? This may be quite true, yet at the same time it can never invalidate the original, God-given right of the community to the soil. The land is the property of the people; it belonged to them from the beginning, and whatever system of tenure may grow up, it will belong to them as long as the race lasts.

Great authorities on this point could be multiplied, but one may suffice. Blackstone writes: 'We think it enough that our title is derived by the grant of the former proprietor, by descent from our ancestors, or by the last will and testament of the dying owner; not caring to reflect that, accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in nature, or in natural law, why a set of words on parchment should convey the dominion of land.' The idea of land being the property of the people is deeply and ineradicably planted in some nations, and especially where the sentiment of patriotism burns most brightly,

Digitized by Google

as in Scotland and Ireland. There are countries, like India and China, in which private appropriation of land is unknown, in which the State, from time immemorial, has owned the soil, and leased it to cultivating tenants.

The original right of the people, it may be thought, goes to the private occupant in consequence of the labour which he has expended upon the land, and which gives it value. Undoubtedly it is true that every man has a right to the produce of his own labour, and this gives him a just title to hold it as private property. Just so; the result of the labour is his, but not the land, which is the gift of Nature to man and is the property of the nation. Land is a limited quantity, which man is unable to create or increase, which has no value until labour is applied to it. But labour is an unlimited quantity, and as represented by population and civilisation adds an unlimited amount to land values. Professor Thorold Rogers says: 'I once saw a lease of a nobleman's London estate in Elizabeth's reign. It was £30 a year. At the present time it is reputed to give an annual rent of a quarter of a million. The growth is entirely the work of other people, of their presence, and of their outlay.' The whole commercial value of land is the creation, not of the owner, who may not spend a farthing on it, but of society; the rents of the soil are the common produce of the whole labour of the community. If these things are so, then the presence of society and cultivation gives twice over a claim to the possession of the land by the people.

If the land had been retained on true lines of social evolution, it would have been held for the well-being of the whole community, and any system of tenure devised on such lines must have led to the freest enjoyment of the land and the largest distribution of wealth to be derived from it. Although the notion of absolute individual ownership of land may have no foundation in nature, and although an estate in land is all that the law has ever recognised, yet a certain property in it of a private kind can readily be conceived as quite legitimate and expedient, provided that it does not tend in any way to leave

Digitized by Google

the tiller of the soil to beg or starve. It is a great principle that property in land is an official trust, as Coleridge points out, implying and demanding the performance of immeasurable duties. For land-holding has its responsibilities as well as its privileges, and is not properly viewed till it be viewed as a public trust. In the Book of Isaiah certain principles are laid down as to the use of land. This book has its land question, as a recent commentator points out,[1] and though Isaiah has nothing to say about the land laws peculiar to his people, yet he affirms principles for using land such as are valid in every civilisation. 'God has made the land, not to feed the pride of the few, but the hunger of the many. The prophet condemns the process, always too easy, by which land has been absorbed, and invokes the fury of God upon those who seek to satisfy their greed in this way: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land."' He shows the ruin it works in the shape of depopulation and barrenness, and startles us by declaring all this to be a cry in the ears of the Lord of hosts. 'Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without an inhabitant. For ten acres of vineyard shall yield one bath, and a homer of seed shall yield but one ephah.' Another prophet, Micah, tells us how 'the actual process was carried out with the most cruel evictions and disinheritances.' All this was done, though peculiar land laws existed to prevent it. Once in so often all lands went back from the buyer to the original possessor. Once in seven years, and again in fifty years, there came a year of release, when debtors and creditors stood again on an equal footing to receive their original portion of the land and have the opportunity once more of enjoying it. And in this readjustment the lands went back, not to individuals, but to the families or tribes which had received them at the first. Individual property in land was hardly dreamed of, except by coveteous monopolists whom the prophet condemns.

Granting, however, that property in land may be a right

[1] Professor G. A. Smith.

Digitized by Google

system of tenure, its rightness will evidence itself as a trust held for the good of the people. A good system of tenure, with individual ownership of the land for its chief feature, must be one in which land is held for the community, and is individually cultivated, and thus covered by a numerous, prosperous, and contented people. The use of the land should be for the creation of healthy and happy homes, as this state of things alone makes the nation a great commonwealth. Let us see, then, how far such a result has been effected in our native land. When Christianity first visited our shore, the land belonged to the people equally; and though they were heathen, yet they met in their townships at regular intervals to make their agricultural arrangements, and apportion to each an equal share. A period of history followed, in which large grants of land were made by kings to favourites, and great estates were gained by conquest and confiscation, and *might* for a long time took the place of *right*. The feudal system arose out of successive conquests—the Saxon, the Danish, and the Norman; the land was transferred to the chieftains and warriors of the victorious invaders, and conveyed in turn by them to their retainers upon military tenure. How far the rights of townships belonging to the subject population were respected in those times of revolution we cannot very exactly determine, but there can be little doubt that they were rudely and severely curtailed. If the primitive township had followed the lines of evolution, instead of revolution, the evils that arose in the progress of society would not have sprung up. Take such a township, for example, as that of Dumbarton—one of the oldest in this island—if primitive rights in common land had not only been retained, but extended, miles of ground on the outskirts would have belonged to the township, and its waterworks up in the neighbouring moorland, and the way thither, would have been its undisputed possession; while on ground outside the town its inhabitants might have had the right to build houses for a nominal feu, with a secure title entered in the books of the parish. These rights of primitive township were obscured

Digitized by Google

and overlaid by the cupidity and violence that had free scope in the early days of our history. Yet something like a return to those primitive rights can alone relieve the community of existing burdens, and contribute to the health and happiness of town life. While the villeins, or tillers of the soil under the feudal system, were very much the chattels of their lord, being tied to the soil, and recoverable by law if they fled from it; yet they possessed considerable advantages in the protection of their lord, and in the claim for assistance which arose out of their feeling of dependence. Such relations of the old feudal tie, while implying subjection, had no consciousness of degradation, and bred a strong sense of comradeship. There was not a great difference in the mode of living between lord and villein. The hut of the villein was of the poorest kind; but the castle of the lord was a pile of thick, coarse walls, not so comfortable as a modern workhouse; the one lay on a bed of straw, the other had only rushes; they often dined together at the same table, and had the same education, tastes, and amusements. This state of things survived down to a recent date in the Highlands of Scotland, and a shadow of it still lingers in some old-world parts of England.

After the decline of the old feudal system, the monks got the power and laid hold of the land after the fashion prevailing at Rome. They persuaded the people to make over to them rights in the common lands of the township; grants of land were made to them by pious kings and nobles, and in course of time the monks became the great monopolists of the soil, and many a fat and fruitful estate they made of it at their monastery gates. Their time of overthrow came with the great Reformation movement, and once more the nation's patrimony got into robbers' hands. The nobles took advantage of the confusions of the time, and seized the larger part of the Church's estates. Notwithstanding all this confiscation and displacement, ownership of land still continued to be regarded by English law as a public trust, and it was looked to for meeting the expenditure connected with the defence of the country and the maintenance of government. As the towns freed themselves, and trade

Digitized by Google

began to flourish, taxation was laid on personal property; and in the hands of landlord Parliaments from the Civil War downwards, the burden of responsibility borne by the land was transferred to the back of the people. Soon after the Civil War an attempt was made to replace the charges on land, but it failed; next a compromise, raising half the amount from land and half from excise, was proposed, only to be rejected; and at last the landowners prevailed with Parliament to remove the charge on land altogether. In subsequent legislation, an equal tax of four shillings in the pound was levied on land and personalty, but the Excise duties were still continued, and landlord Parliaments were careful to stave off the growing burdens of the country from themselves. In 1798 Mr. Pitt passed an Act fixing the land tax perpetually at a little over £2,000,000 a year, and successive Parliaments of landowners have managed to divide the burden of growing national expenditure into two proportions, charging £2,000,000 on land and £45,000,000 on personalty.

The difficulty of the problem appears still further when the aggregation of land is seen to be in the hands of a few. What is the right of a community—the common heritage of all—has passed into a monopoly. Without land man would cease to exist. It is the great storehouse of materials, out of which labour is the only factor in the production of wealth, and to which labour, therefore, should have the freest access; yet it is locked up beyond the reach of labour in every possible way, and claimed as the property of a handful of men. In England more than 150 millions of acres are held by about 18,000 proprietors. In Scotland 171 hold over 11 millions of acres; 330 hold two-thirds of the land; and 1700 over nine-tenths of the whole country. In Ireland less than 2000 persons own two-thirds of the soil; and while 5 or 6 millions of inhabitants have tilled it and given it all its present value, not a man among them owns one sod of the soil. Many of these proprietors are absentees, and the labourers are left at home to make the land rich on starvation wages, and swell the fund

Digitized by Google

which enables absentees to spend idle and luxurious lives in London or fashionable Continental resorts. In consequence of this appropriation of land, which the Creator plainly intended for the use of all, we meet with a primary inequality which gives rise to many others, and places in the very heart of our civilisation a fruitful source of social wrong and misery.

This monopoly of natural resources has been productive of evils in directions too numerous to mention, but one or two may be noticed.

It has created a class of rich idlers in society.—They are not wealth producers, but simply wealth consumers. Nor do we, when making such a statement, forget that they may return a percentage of their rents to the soil in the shape of improvements. This may be admitted, and yet it is true that they do not earn the wealth they have by any industry or skill, but by the good luck of having monopolised a bit of the earth's surface. 'They never do any work; they pride themselves upon the fact that for hundreds of years their ancestors have never done any work; they look with the utmost contempt, not merely upon the man who works, but even upon the man whose grandfather had to work. Yet they live in luxury. They have town houses and country houses, horses, carriages, packs of hounds. . . . And they have wealth to spare, which they can invest in railway shares or public debts, or in buying up land in the United States.'

It has given birth to a privileged and domineering caste.—Exclusive property in land is an exclusive privilege, and it is apt to breed an exclusive temperament. Land has its duties as well as its rights, and Christianity bids us think of the first a great deal more than of the second; but exclusive ownership of land has too often reversed this law of Christian ethics. Possession of land is the source of power, and when power is used for bettering those who live on it, the result is good. There are model landlords, such as the late Lord Tollemache, who had enormous estates in Cheshire, and gave his whole time for sixty years to the duties of property. He plotted out some eighty or

Digitized by Google

ninety farms of 200 acres each, put up buildings in proportion to the holdings, erected labourers' cottages, with gardens, at an expenditure of nearly £300,000. He used to say that the only real and lasting pleasure derived from the possession of a landed estate is to witness the improvement in the social condition of those residing on it. He must have paid for his estate over and over again. If he were a typical instance, there would be little ground for complaint against 'landlordism' or hereditary private ownership; there may be other peers and landowners who try to manage their estates as dutifully as he did, but when we speak of a landlord it is not usually a Lord Tollemache that occurs to us. He may not be the '"God Almighty" of the country-side,' as the poet-laureate describes him, but he can be despotic enough to interfere with the religious and political freedom of his tenants. He has the right and the power to keep none but Church people on his land, and to expel parties who venture to vote, not according to his dictation, but according to their conviction. The history of Dissent could furnish many a tale of cruelty and wrong due to such interference.

It has led to scandalous evictions, especially in Ireland and Scotland.

The wholesale evictions in Ireland exhibit a contempt of human rights hardly equalled by any story of human wrong and suffering. Landlords have done what they liked with their own, and present to-day the spectacle of a nation decimated, full of sedition, and continually on the verge of starvation. About the time of the great famine in 1848, more than 200,000 evictions took place; while town lands were depopulated, and the inhabitants driven off to make room for cattle and sheep. Multitudes of these people now line the ditches of Munster or the hillsides of Donegal, where they have found patches of bog and rock, and manured the soil, such as it is, with sea-weed brought from the shore on the backs of men and women, till it can be made to grow something. Yet for these patches they have to pay their absentee landlords a rent varying from one to four pounds an acre; and if they fail to pay this rent, which is

Digitized by Google

often more than they can get out of the land, they are liable any day to be evicted. Many more have been driven across the Atlantic, so that in Ireland millions of acres have been turned into waste, and the population reduced from 8 to 5 millions. The same process of depopulation has been at work in the Highlands of Scotland, and has driven away the clansmen from their native glens, or reduced them to poverty and discontent. Through the landlord's desire to make room for grouse, sheep, and deer, and thus draw his rents more easily, the crofters have been turned adrift to seek a precarious subsistence on the loch sides; there are glens, now inhabited by a couple of shepherds and gamekeepers, that once sent out their thousands of fighting men; whole villages have been shipped off to Canada and the United States. As Dr. Macdonald says: 'The extermination of the Highlanders has been carried on for many years as systematically and relentlessly as of the North American Indians. . . . Who can withhold sympathy as whole families have turned to take a last look at the heavens red with their burning houses? The poor people shed no tears, for there was in their hearts that which stifled such signs of emotions; they were absorbed in despair. They were forced away from that which was near and dear to their hearts, and their patriotism was treated with contemptuous mockery.' And just as in Ireland not one-sixth of the soil is under cultivation, so in the Highlands there is the solitude of the grouse moor and the deer forest, where a century ago were the homes of men. Two million acres have been turned into such a solitude, and tens of thousands of families have been evicted to make it. Ten years ago a Royal Commission recommended that this depopulation of the Highland glens should be stayed, and yet since then about half a million acres have been converted into deer forests.

Monopoly of land *has robbed the public of much of its free enjoyment.*

By this we do not mean the abstract and inherent right of the people to all the land, in opposition to private ownership, but to such portions of it as it would be presumptuous for any

Digitized by Google

owner to claim absolutely, or appropriate to himself. It is not easy for us to understand how the greed of individual possession could go so far as to claim the vast forest lands and mountain ranges and moorland wastes of our country, or could venture to shut out anyone who chose, in search of health or science, to roam over heaths or through woods. In days of old the people could cut their turf from the moorland, trap a rabbit or hare in the forest, pasture their cows on the large domain or common, and could do so free of interference or charge. But all that freedom of access and of use is gone, and how far it has disappeared through force or fraud or sale, or all three combined, we do not stop to inquire. It is a trespass for the tourist or naturalist to explore the glens or tread the wild mountains of his native land. The ancient forest is enclosed with fences, on the other side of which one reads the well-known legend, 'Trespassers will be prosecuted,' and sometimes it is added 'with the utmost rigour of the law'; the moorlands are patrolled by gamekeepers with loaded guns and authority to turn back intruders, or take them before a magistrate and have them put in prison. All landlords may not be so autocratic, but they have the power so to act, and the sooner they are deprived of it the better.

But this is not all. Large grants of land were made under the feudal system in return for military service, but considerable parts still remained as commons for the free use of the people. The existence of these commons kept alive the principle that the soil was intended for all, and not for a few. Soon, however, these communal lands began to be enclosed by the aristocracy, and an evidence of their enormous areas may be gathered from the fact that under Acts passed between 1710 and 1843 no fewer than 7½ millions of acres of these lands have been appropriated to private ownership. The old time commons round townships have fallen into the grasp of landlords, and even the old footpaths over the commons, often made through hazel-thicket and by tinkling brook, have been forestalled and obliterated, though a few of them survive to show us what has

Digitized by Google

been lost. So have the people been disinherited—robbed of their birthright.

Exclusive property *in land has made its owners practically owners of the people.*

Under this system of tenure, private owners are to all intents and purposes masters of the country, and the people are given into their hands for a prey. They have full power to drive the people off the soil or to forbid them from using it. And this arbitrary power has been too frequently exercised. The concentration of land in a few owners has given them undue control over those who occupy it. 'To whomsoever the soil at any time belongs, to him belong the fruits of it.' By owning it they are able to appropriate the produce of labour for permission to use it; they can make their own terms, which tend to be of such a kind that the labourer becomes absolutely dependent on his landlord, and gets barely enough wherewith to support himself and family. Since land commands labour so absolutely under this monopoly, it dooms labour to pay for its use a price, 'which strips the many of the wealth they justly earn, to pile it up in the hands of the few who do nothing to earn it.' Labour can be got for less than keeps a slave in good marketable condition, and when the labourer is worked out he can go on the parish. The worst feature in connection with the land difficulty is that it is not our crops of corn which in the first instance have failed, but our crops of men. This aggregation of land into great estates has denuded the country of its stalwart sons, expatriating the clansmen who formerly composed our famous Highland regiments, and causing to disappear the yeomen who won Crecy and Agincourt, formed Cromwell's Ironsides, and were the pride of every country village. All over the land one comes upon grassy spots with clumps of trees, and marked by heaps of ruins—traces of homes in which a sturdy and independent race of peasant proprietors were once reared. In many country districts the traveller seems to be passing over a land bereft of its inhabitants, while those who remain are few and far between; they are the most ill-paid

Digitized by Google

and badly-housed of the labouring classes, men with stunted bodies and dwarfed minds, with scarcely anything of family life, kept near the starvation line, drudging for long hours, and leading dreary monotonous lives. On estates in Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, and other English counties, agricultural labourers earn a beggarly pittance of ten, eleven, or twelve shillings for a week of eighty or ninety working hours. As a result of landlordism, the pauperism of country districts is not only perpetuated, but increased.

In consequence of this land appropriation, the position of an agricultural labourer has become a degradation and a misery; and if he has any soul left in him he prefers to go into the town, and finds himself better off at unloading grain, coal-heaving, or other casual work. If he has been worked out in the country, he helps likewise to swell the residuum of the town. Thus driven off the land, where there is plenty of room to enjoy healthy and happy lives for hundreds of thousands of men, he drifts to the great centres of population, there to overstock the labour-market or add to the 'submerged tenth.'

Still futher does land monopoly stand responsible for the overcrowding of towns, and all the evils of disease and vice proceeding from it. Our landed system girdles our towns as with a dead wall, enabling the owner of broad acres to refuse one or two of them for town extension, or to ask for them exorbitant prices. It is almost impossible, under the present system, to acquire land in small plots at agricultural prices; and this restriction on the growth of towns is the source of incalculable mischief. For it not only leads to an oppressive increase of land and house rents, and a system of building leases resulting in unsound house-building and injurious to the health of the community, but it likewise tempts town landlords to convert their gardens into lanes of hovels, the result of which has been a concentration of squalor, degradation, and misery, that is the shame alike of our civilisation and our Christianity.

Digitized by Google

V.

LAND QUESTION—LAND REFORM.

In consequence of such abuses there is a Land Question. From the standpoint of principle or abstract right, private ownership in land, we have seen, is fairly open to criticism. For in the judgment of leading thinkers, the land of every country belongs to the people of that country, and no man is an absolute owner of land. The idea of absolute possession is unknown to English law. Writers have pushed this idea to its ultimate consequences, and pointed out that a claim to exclusive property in the soil involves a land-owning despotism. Herbert Spencer thus puts it: 'If the landowners have a valid right to the surface of our planet, all who are not landowners have no right at all to its surface.' Since the nation is the ultimate owner of the soil, an eminent jurist says that 'all landowners are merely tenants in the eye of the law.' The primary right of ownership in land has always belonged, and must always belong, to the nation; individual rights of ownership can only come by a secondary title, which the nation may at any time, if desirous, take back again. But when the 'tortuous and ungodly jumble' of our Land Laws is considered, and when the evil comes about that the land plainly exists not for the people but for a few persons, it is evident that something needs to be done. Some will say that reform ought to be instant and thorough, but a system which has been the product of centuries, and which involves enormous interests, cannot be so easily exposed and overturned.

Digitized by Google

The Land Question has been before the country for fifty years, and it is interesting to trace it from one stage to another, and see how it has developed till it is now the fundamental and overwhelming problem of the day. When it was first raised, it signified a group of minor proposals, such as a cheaper mode of conveyancing and a simpler form of transfer than existed at the time. Nothing could be more modest than such a reform, but it did not touch the fringe of the grievance. Besides dealing with the Corn Laws, Richard Cobden had examined the Land Laws, and found in them as black a record of fraud and injustice as under the protective system; keenly alive to the mischief of primogeniture, tying up land, and a system of taxation that favoured landowners and cheated the public, he used the memorable words: 'If I were five-and-twenty, or thirty, instead of, unhappily, twice that number of years, I would take Adam Smith in hand—I would not go beyond him, I would have no politics in it, and I would have a league for free land, just as we had a free trade in corn.' Such were the utmost demands of the land reformers in the early years of this century. The writings of John Stuart Mill advanced the Land Question another important stage. Accepting Ricardo's theory of rent as being regulated by the inherent qualities of the lands, he inferred that land should be treated on principles different from those which affect other property, and that its value could be enchanced by the labours of others. He advocated not common property in land, but the resumption by the State of future additions to its market value in the shape of improvements. This he called the 'unearned increment of land.' That proposal met with favour so long as rent was everywhere rising, but since the income from lands has fallen nearly £1,000,000 during the last ten years, the unearned increment is seldom mentioned. Another reform of a more sweeping description has come into vogue—the 'Nationalisation of the Land,' and the two chief advocates of this drastic measure are Henry George, the prophet of San Francisco, and Alfred Russell Wallace, the distinguished naturalist. Henry George's book on

Digitized by Google

Progress and Poverty, fascinating not only for its deftness in the treatment of economic problems, but for the moral enthusiasm and burning eloquence with which it pleads the claims of justice and equal rights, has had an immense circulation in America and Great Britain, and has done more than anything else to bring the Land Question into public view. He proposes the entire abolition of all taxes by the laying of such a tax on land as would render it unprofitable for anyone to hold it without putting it to its full use. It is not necessary, he argues, to resort to expropriation; it will be enough to increase the land tax so as to absorb rent, and shift the burden of taxation from the fruits of labour, lower the selling price of land, throw it open, when unused, for improvement, put a stop to its monopoly, bring more of it under cultivation, and let labour find access to enlarged natural opportunities. By a substitution of this single land tax for other taxes, the State could let the labourer have the full reward of his labour, and the capitalist the full return of his capital. If it were imposed, it would replace the population on the land, spread prosperity all over the country, and equalise the distribution of wealth. These views of Henry George are not original. In 1854 Patrick Dove published a treatise on *The Elements of Political Science*, and put forth a theory of Land Reform which so struck the Hon. Charles Sumner, an American senator, that he had an account of it stereotyped in Boston. A letter to this effect from Sumner is in possession of Dove's family. It is the identical theory of Henry George's volume, as a few extracts will show. Mention is made of three sources of poverty, and Dove says the third is 'the work of the laws of the land, which have made such a distribution of the sources of human support that, although Almighty God made a plentiful provision for all, yet some are reduced to poverty, because others, without labour on their part, are elevated to great comparative wealth.' 'The rent-value ought to be allocated to those who create it; I do not hesitate to say, to the Nation.' 'National property there must be somewhere, and assuredly it is more just to take that property from the natural value of the

Digitized by Google

soil than from the individual fruits of industry.' 'There is no other possible way than to reserve the rents of the soil in perpetuity to the whole of the community, and to extend the same for the benefit of the whole, in paying the government, the judicature, a universal system of education, etc., and in facilitating the progress of the whole community.' 'Either the nation must be sacrificed to the landed interest, or the landed interest must be sacrificed to the interests of the nation. Either the population will found or seek new countries where labour shall meet with a more equitable reward, or a war of classes will ultimately ensue, having for its theme, not liberty as in former days, but property.' Dove concludes his summary of advantages to be derived by allocating the rents of the soil to the nation thus: 'It is the law of God, as declared in the constitution of the terrestrial world, and the law of Christianity, that the industrious man should be rich, and that the man who labours not should be poor. The richest men in England are those who do not labour, and who never did labour.' These extracts show not only that an old Scotch prophet anticipated, and mayhap inspired, the prophet of San Francisco, but that he forecast larger questions of Disestablishment and Disendowment than Ecclesiastical ones; murmurings of which now break everywhere on our ears.

Many of these ends are devoutly to be wished, but whether an immediate substitution of this single tax on rent for all other taxes is now just or fair, every temperate thinker will be disposed to call in question. George would let landlords keep their land, but would tax it eighty or ninety per cent., leaving them just enough to meet the expenses of management. He advocates confiscation of rent, pure and simple, while he allows those who hold the land still to retain it, and still to buy and sell it. He says: 'It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.' This seems to be only a refinement of language, as it still involves confiscation. Admitting it to be so, George discounts the landowner's claim to compensation by arguing that his possession of the land is

Digitized by Google

robbery, and that a robber has no vested rights. 'If the land belongs to the people, why continue to permit landowners to take the rent, or compensate them in any manner for the loss of rent?' He declaims on justice, and would proceed to confiscate property that had been purchased in as good faith as the coat which Mr. George has on his back. So rhetorically large-hearted is he in view of the public good that some one describes his scheme as 'No taxes at all, and a pension for everybody.'

A rival scheme of Land Nationalisation has been set forth by Mr. Alfred Wallace, who advocates a properly-guarded system of occupying ownership under the State in the place of landlordism, and seeks to show that just as the cultivator of land has a permanent interest in it, he is well off, happy, and contented. He holds that the State must be sole owner of the land, and guarantee to tenants a permanent tenure, and put no restrictions on the cultivation and sale of holdings, except to prohibit all sub-letting, and limit mortgages. Tenants under the State will be required to pay 'quit-rent' on the inherent value of the land, but shall be entitled to full property in the 'additional value' they give to the land, such as fences, buildings, and permanent improvements. While they are subject to due payment of rent to the State, they shall have the right to an exclusive use of the land, and the further right to sell or transfer to others their interest in all improvements. Mr. Wallace holds that landowners and their heirs must be compensated, and proposes to secure for them the full revenue they have hitherto derived from the land in the shape of annuities, equivalent to what the State has taken from them, and terminable after, say, three lives. In pleading for this great reform, Wallace seeks to be tender to vested interests, and to interfere as little as possible with the property or the means of enjoyment of individuals. Another feature of this scheme, and one attractive to all land reformers, would be that a free choice of cheap land might be offered to every one, and population thus be drawn back to the country. 'Every Englishman should be

Digitized by Google

allowed *once in his life* to select a plot of land for his personal occupation. His right of choice will be, of course, limited to agricultural or waste land; it will also be limited to land bordered by public roads affording access to it; it will further be limited to a quantity of not less than one acre or more than five acres, and will cease on any estate from which a fixed proportion, say ten per cent. of the whole, has been taken, while it should not apply at all to very small holdings; and, finally, it will be limited by proximity to the dwelling of the occupier of the land, so as to subject him to no unnecessary annoyance.' This writer does not, however, propose to restrict the amount of land which anyone may hold; he does not find a solution of the problem in a system of small holdings or a peasant proprietary, though he closes his book with this quotation from Boyd Kinnear's work on *Principles of Property in Land*: 'Who does not see how much happier England will be when, instead of one great mansion surrounded by miles beyond miles of one huge property, farmed by the tenants at will of one landlord, tilled by mere labourers, whose youth and manhood know no relaxation from rough mechanical toil, whose old age sees no home but the chance of charity or the certainty of the workhouse, there shall be a thousand estates of varying size, where each owner shall work for himself and his children, where the sense of independence shall lighten the burdens of daily toil, where education shall give resources, and the labour of youth shall suffice for the support of age.'

Every patriot says Amen to these descriptions of a widely populated and fruitful land, and they do admirable service in drawing attention to agrarian reforms; yet when we discount them and bring sober common sense to bear on such schemes for the nationalisation of the land, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they involve something like confiscation or folly. When they are coloured with visions of prosperity and happiness, they enchant the popular gaze, but they are apt to be as delusive as the South Sea Bubble, and are wisely dismissed by practical minds as belonging to the region of Utopia.

Digitized by Google

George's scheme plainly confiscates land to the State under the form of a tax which would rob the landlord of eighty or ninety per cent. of rent, place him in the position of a mere pensioner on the State, and drive him away from the country to the city, or to live abroad. Wallace's plan, however considerate to the landlord, virtually amounts to the same thing, for he would confiscate private property after two lives. Many of his followers, seeing this to be so, have formed a society, under the name of the 'English Land Restoration League,' which declares that it 'cannot tolerate the idea that the people of England shall be compelled to buy back the land which is theirs by natural right, or to compensate those who now appropriate their earnings for the loss of power to appropriate those earnings in future.' Under George's inspiration, this League proposes to tax the land until the whole annual value is taken for the public benefit. The demand for the taxation of land up to the limit of its value is plainly unfair, because it imposes all the burden of maintaining the public service upon one section of society. It would exempt the rich capitalist from the payment necessary to good government; it would spoil the landowner and put a large part of the spoil into the pocket of the capitalist. It is a well-recognised principle that representation implies taxation. All alike—landowner, capitalist, and workmen—all, according to their income, ought to bear the burden of maintaining the public service. Schemes for nationalising the land, if not open to the charge of confiscation, are not free from the charge of folly. To secure their object by purchase, the State would require two thousand millions to buy out the landlords, and what State could face such a pecuniary undertaking? If the owners of land are to be expropriated at the full value of their property, and the State made universal landlord, no end of difficulties would arise from entrusting such a business to the management of the State. Many hold that the State should take the railway system under its control, but see that the cost of transference and the difficulty of administration are so great as to be well-nigh impracticable. This undertaking would,

Digitized by Google

however, be simplicity itself compared with the expenditure and administration involved in managing the land. It would impose on the State the most gigantic functions, 'which would require a machinery which, were it entirely honest and thoroughly efficient, would cost more than all which the project hoped to gain, would create an enormous body of fundholders (the recipients of the rents which the Government received for the use of the national estate),—fundholders who would not be, by the very terms of the bargain, tied by a single responsibility to the society which paid them the dividends on the new stock, and would certainly lead to a bureaucracy which would be vexatious, inquisitorial, and corrupt.'[1] The management of such a vast interest would afford Government officials great scope for corruption and jobbery.

Another scheme for destroying land monopoly deserves passing notice. 'Free trade in land' has been recommended as a panacea. It has been tried in Ireland, but the experiment has failed. It prevails in America, but the Bonanza farms of Minnesota, Dakota, Texas, Kansas, and California, containing each of them twenty, sixty, or even a hundred thousand acres, are in the hands of rich companies, and are conducted not unlike the *latifundia*, or large estates, which Pliny describes as having ruined Italy. Free trade in land would consign it to great capitalists, like Winans, who, if they wished, could turn it into more deer forests.

It has been the mistake of land reformers, in devising such ambitious schemes, to assume that the evils they contend with can be cured by any single measure. Henry George urges his single tax remedy, as a vendor of some patent medicine advertises that his nostrum will cure every ill that flesh is heir to; he tells us that it will raise wages, extirpate pauperism, lessen crime, elevate morals, and carry civilisation to still nobler heights. The truth is that no one measure or remedy can solve a problem so vast, so deeply rooted, and of such all-pervading issues. It needs the most various treatment; it must be slowly,

[1] Thorold Rogers, *Work and Wages.*

Digitized by Google

but surely attacked from many sides. A system of land tenure, the growth of centuries, with its roots mixed up in the foundations of our social fabric, cannot be rectified all at once; however much it may be out of consonance with the spirit of the age, it cannot be swept away with some stroke, as of a magician's wand. Our way of going forward in this country is by reform, and not by revolution. France got rid of its old, corrupt *noblesse*, and obtained a better land system and a wider distribution of wealth, but only through a baptism of blood which no nation would care to repeat, even for such a prize. With an enlightened public opinion always advancing, and a just constitutional Government more and more bent on giving effect to the will of the people, who does not see that the present system of land tenure must sooner or later be brought into conformity with the ideas and requirements of the century? There is a great and powerful body of landowners, tenacious of their privileges, but they cannot withstand the stronger force of the national judgment, once freely and constitutionally expressed. The Land Laws were characterised by Cromwell as a 'tortuous and ungodly jumble' in his day, and since then, under Landlord Parliaments, the jumble has become still more tortuous and ungodly; but although order cannot be expected to come immediately from chaos, it will emerge most certainly, and it will emerge in such a way as to unlock the land and make it accessible to the people.

Let us turn meanwhile from sweeping projects and violent remedies of land nationalisers, and try to indicate such reforms as are practicable and within measurable distance of being realised.

The first important reform must be the destruction of those laws which impede the free sale and division of land, and its cheap and easy transfer. At present it is locked up under primogeniture and entail, and these obnoxious privileges must be abrogated. It was natural, in primitive ages, to regard the father as directing head of the family, and to continue the eldest son in headship, as the most experienced member of

Digitized by Google

the family; it was expedient for fighting purposes in feudal times, and long afterwards, that power should be concentrated in the hands of chiefs, and that they should hold land in large allotments. But after these conditions of society had passed away, the custom of bequeathing the whole of the land to one heir should also have disappeared. To that custom another has been added, that of entail, whereby settlements upon land are made for the benefit of widows and younger children, or for creditors. In many cases the owner of land is tied down by such settlements, and cannot make any proper disposition of it. Large estates are often heavily mortgaged, and consequently left to starve because their nominal owners have not the means of promoting improvements. The law of entail overrides the laws of nature, and preserves a system of limited ownership that keeps parents from dividing their estates in accordance with the dictates of justice and equality. The system is no real benefit to anyone, and an injury to the welfare of the State; with the abrogation of primogeniture and entail the whole of that injurious system would disappear, large estates would be more and more subdivided, and the sale of smaller allotments would come into the market.

Along with this free division of land there should be a simple and inexpensive method of transfer. Instead of the cumbrous and costly process by which titles to property are verified, something of a much simpler kind ought to be adopted. The present method stands much in the way of multiplying small owners. In other countries, like France and Belgium, land courts have been instituted for the registration of titles and for easy transfer. After a sale of land, the transfer of title should be made so simple a process that the aid of a lawyer to effect the transfer would not be required. County, district, and municipal land offices ought to be established; the officials should consist of a registrar, revising surveyor, and such assistants as may be found necessary, and their salaries should be defrayed from the revenues accruing to the land office in the county, district, or corporation; and every application for

Digitized by Google

registry of claims to right of ownership in land, when made according to due form, should be passed without fee or charge of any kind. If such a cheap and easy transfer existed, nothing would do more to alter land monopoly and increase small ownership.

Another movement, with reference to land in and around large towns, is taking definite shape, and promising to correct the evils of land-holding there. It is well known that, where population is sparse, land has no great value, but as men congregate into centres it rises in value, and the rise increases with the growth of the inhabitants. In the life of every community occasions spring up for extending its boundaries, and land has to be acquired for the purpose. The town needs to be enlarged or beautified or made healthy, by spreading out into new streets or public works or public parks; but it is met at every turn by the wolves of greed, or by grievous legal restrictions. Owners of land show at this point to an aggravated degree the evils of the system of one man letting or selling land, in order to get the largest income he can from it. He has done nothing to make the land valuable; its value is created entirely by the growth of population, by the presence and labour of the people, therefore that value does not belong to him, but to the people. The land may be of little use to him, and yet he can withhold the use of it absolutely, or till such time as he can command a price of his own. Illustrations of absolute withholding are to be found everywhere, and illustrations of withholding till an exorbitant price can be imposed may be seen in large plots of vacant ground within townships. Besides these hindrances to the acquisition of land, special powers from Parliament must be obtained, and expensive formalities of conveyancing must be observed. Now it is necessary to simplify the last-mentioned requirements, and give county and town councils the power to obtain by agreement, or compulsorily on fair terms, land which they deem to be needed for the public good. The national right of ownership in land ought to be acknowledged and vindicated thus far. That right can never lapse in the course

Digitized by Google

of social evolution; and even if the nation thought it wise to nationalise the land, and resolved to do it, they have a perfect right to do it. There is what they term in the United States 'the right of eminent domain,' the lawful authority to appropriate individual property for the public benefit, as the public safety or convenience may demand. If this right, generally recognised in most countries, were in operation so far as we have indicated, every township might purchase or lease a square mile of ground, and people might build houses on it, with a secure title entered in the parish book, and without the formality of title-deeds. It is the unnatural cost of sites and of legal instruments that prevents the better housing of the working classes in large towns. Let the law arrange a cheap registration of titles and an easy mortgage on Government advances, and the effect on the cost of building would be such that the industrious poor could be housed in two-roomed dwellings, with all the conveniences of decency and cleanliness. All syndicates of land should be abolished, but land in common might be held by co-operative bodies for the public welfare.

A group of questions touching the incidence of taxation needs to be considered and readjusted. Agricultural land has been falling in value, and reduction of rents to farmers has taken place and still goes on, but urban land continues to rise, and advances are made on its use—advances of an oppressive kind to the tradesman. By the Agricultural Holdings Act the farmer has some security now for the capital and labour which he puts in the soil, but the tradesman who has risked his all in a business rooted in one locality is at the mercy of his landlord. As it has been shortly put, 'He may be ejected unless he consents to harassing terms, pays a heavy fine, and agrees first to make his house better than he found it, and then to pay a rent based on his own outlay.' Local taxation is laid mainly on the occupier in towns. Land there has an enhanced value, because there is a stint of it, and consequently it is created by the law into a perpetual corner for the injury of the many and the profit of a few. The owner can do as he likes

Digitized by Google

with the occupier, heap all the local taxes upon him, requires him to pay for the roads, the drainage, and the water supply which give an increased value to the ground rent; he makes the tenant pay twice over, first for improvements in increased rent, and then for the improvements directly; and then not only can he raise the rent on these improvements, but appropriate them by a terminable lease at the expiry of the term. It is difficult to conceive anything more exacting. 'The occupier in towns is worse used by far than the Irish tenant was before the changes of the Land Act, for if the landlord made him pay interest on his own outlay, the cost of local taxation was shared between the parties.'[1]

The wonder is that a movement has not been started long ago for the division of local taxes between owner and occupier, for the enfranchisement of leaseholds, and for something like the payment of ground rents into the national exchequer, or for the relief of indirect taxation on the many. The larger question still, for whose solution the Georgians propose a single tax on the land alone, presents a number of evils that ought to be dealt with in a fair and effective manner. For two hundred years the burden of taxation has been thrown upon the workers, while the landowners have been practically free. To tax land at only £2,000,000, and personalty at £45,000,000, is an inequality altogether wrong and oppressive. What legislation has thus unjustly imposed, it should justly correct again, and do so as quickly and effectually as possible. Landowners have been freed from their burdens, and the workers have been crushed by the transference of these burdens to their shoulders. Land does not carry its legitimate share of growing national expenditure. A much larger, if not the major part, of taxation should be drawn out of land values, and not out of the industry of the people, to which the land is indebted for any value which it possesses.

Such measures as we have noticed are so many ways of attacking land monopoly, but they are not the only ways, and

[1] Thorold Rogers, *Work and Wages.*

Digitized by Google

others still more thorough, while falling short of schemes to nationalise or municipalise the soil, must be devised. To all nationalising projects the objection is fatal that they can only be carried out by a colossal act of robbery, or by a purchase so enormous that no State would undertake it. To restore the land to the people, and the people to the land, is a praiseworthy object. We are all agreed that every obstacle to the transfer of land in the form of obsolete customs ought to be cleared away, that its subdivision should be encouraged by every honest means, and that, if practicable, the agricultural labourer should borrow for his cottage as the landlord has borrowed for his drains. No change would give greater stability to our institutions than the covering of the land with a million or two of freeholders. They would alter nothing except under compulsion, be as free as existing landlords from Socialistic proclivities, and resuscitate that great class of yeomen whose name is a proverb for sturdy and independent courage, and whose extinction is one of the greatest evils inflicted upon the nation by the present Land Laws. Is it possible, then, to recall such an intelligent, industrious, and energetic population to country districts, and stop the drift of agricultural labourers to the squalid quarters of our cities and towns? There are two millions of people less on the land than there were a few years ago, and most of them have been drained into the towns, and the towns are kept up by them in bone and sinew and energy, but they are too soon transformed into waste. Ponder the words from *Labour and Life in East London*, by Charles Booth: 'London does not act well by countrymen. She draws them in by her varied attractions, her flaring gas-lights, her crowded streets, her busy life, and her countless chances which strike the imagination, and contrast with the dull monotony of rural life. Sooner or later, it may be in the first generation, or the second, or the third, the spell may fall on them, and the process of deterioration begins. London has been called the Circe among cities, and the analogy is a close one; for too often she exercises over her visitants her

Digitized by Google

irresistible fascination, only in the end to turn them into swine.'

How shall we save our country from this drain and decay? How shall we continue to develop the bone and muscle of a strong nation? It is absolutely essential to our prosperity as a nation that this system of huge estates, held by idle owners, be greatly altered, and that land should be held in possession by such a tenure as to secure the means of subsistence for the greatest number of people. Economic law unites with patriotic sentiment in affirming that land should be entrusted to those who will make the best use of it, and divided into such dimensions as to advance most fully the common interests of the cultivators and the State. At present a handful of men take £150,000,000 a year as rent, let the toilers disappear from the soil, and make the nation dependent on the foreigner for the bread it eats. Two-thirds of the cereal food of the nation is imported from abroad, and if an enemy's cruisers were to arrest this supply, the acutest suffering would be inflicted on millions in this country. Lord Derby tells us that the lands of Great Britain are not providing one-half of the food which they are capable of producing. It has been estimated that if all the land of the kingdom, 500 million acres, were properly cultivated, produce would be increased by the amount of £421,000,000 annually, and would be sufficient to provide for double the population. Why, then, should we be dependent on foreign supply? Do we overestimate the tremendous risk of such dependence?

The simple difficulty is that the toilers have been deprived of, and are now refused access to, the needful instruments of industry. By the law of 'laying field to field,' and by the woes of that law, they have been left with no place in the midst of the earth. By the process of that law, land has been thrown out of cultivation, tillage turned into sheepwalks, and sheepwalks into shootings; roads and footpaths which pass by fields, by rivers, and by lonely glens, as well as commons, have been taken from the people; pleasant places of the earth, such as

Digitized by Google

mountains, moors, woodlands, and seashores, are preserved and placarded in honour of the proud few; while the many must crowd into squalid cities and dismal agricultural towns, and take their holidays in the few country lanes left free for them. All this must be undone, and the people have back their rights again, if glory is to dwell in our land. Not only must the right of access to rivers, mountains, and uncultivated lands be obtained for whosoever will, but also the right of access to all cultivated lands, that the people, by using them aright, may share in and add to the national wealth.

If the occupier and cultivator were also the virtual owner, and if, without going so far as a measure of Land Nationalisation, he could have secure occupation and unfettered use of the soil, then the fruits of his labour being secured to him, along with the increased value of his permanent improvements, he would have all that he could acquire, and it would not be any advantage for him to be the owner of land capital besides. It is the blot of our land system to have a class tilling the soil, yet entirely divorced from any enjoyment that makes agriculture attractive; spending their whole lives in this labour without the pleasure of seeing their own crops grow and their own fruit trees blossom and bear fruit. In no other country are the people so completely cut off from the soil which they cultivate. In other countries, where they have an interest in the soil and agriculture is practised by those who enjoy its fruits, great comfort is secured for a numerous population, and with it a great independence of character corresponding to an independent position; under such a system families are not seen living in abject poverty or fleeing from their native place as from the plague. Switzerland is a case in point. In the valleys of Switzerland 'the peasants endeavour to outstrip one another in the quality and quantity of the produce, in the preparation of the ground, and in the general cultivation of their respective portions. All the little proprietors are eager to find out how to farm so as to produce the greatest results; they diligently seek after improvements; they send their children

Digitized by Google

to agricultural schools in order to fit them to assist their fathers; and each proprietor soon adopts a new improvement introduced by any of his neighbours.'[1] The German peasant is a proprietor of the soil, works hard, and is free from want. William Howitt, speaking of rural life in Germany, says that 'the German *Bauer* looks on the country as made for him and his fellowmen. No man can threaten him with ejection or the workhouse so long as he is active and economical. He walks, therefore, with a bold step; he looks you in the face with the air of a freeman, but a respectful air.'

The Suffolk squire, Arthur Young, who travelled in France just before the outbreak of the Revolution, describes the evils of the old agricultural system which that outbreak swept away, and which contrast so vividly with the benefits that have been secured by the system of peasant proprietorship. 'Wherever you stumble on a grand seignieur,' he says, 'even one that is worth millions, you find his property desert.' That sentence read the doom of a class that forgot its duties and thought only of its interests. He describes Brittany as a land of wastes, as 'a country possessing nothing but privilege and poverty'; under an industrious peasantry it has won for itself the title of 'the granary of France,' and may fairly be styled 'the market-garden of England.' The barren country, which saddened Young's eyes a hundred years ago, now delights the traveller as a rich country with a prosperous population, the poorest of whom eat asparagus, green peas, and strawberries, every day in season. Nowhere has Young's famous aphorism about the magic of property turning sand to gold been better exemplified than in France since the Revolution. Could such a peasantry, under a new tenure, be placed on our land, what an unspeakable blessing it would prove to be! At too great a cost it would be won by Revolution, but it ought to be accomplished by Reform. The question of method still remains. How can it be done? How is a minuter division of the soil to be brought about, and how shall the flow of population from

[1] Kay, *Free Trade in Land.*

Digitized by Google

town to country be initiated, not to say accelerated? And, if two or three millions could be spread over the land, would it be as freeholders, or as holders under the State, or as tenants of the present landlords? These three kinds of occupancy may be said to comprehend the different forms of tenure under which any solution of the land problem can be looked for. Although the indictment against Landlordism is a heavy one, yet, if it could still awake to its duties, and hold its interests meanwhile in abeyance, something might be done to repair the desolations of many generations. After the complete breakdown of large tenant-farming, as shown in the present agricultural depression, large monopolists of land should see the wisdom of considering and adopting new methods fitted to bring back an industrious people to the land, and help to make it more productive. Instead of the nationalisation of the land, the *moralisation* of the landlord might perhaps be a simpler and speedier method after all. To explain this statement, take an illustration from a book on Border Church Life. 'About 1780 the lord of the manor granted leases of nineteen times nineteen years, and with this security of tenure the feuars had built more substantial and comfortable houses. Additional privileges were granted in the shape of small holdings. About 380 acres of land contiguous to the village of Morebattle had been occupied as two farms, at a total rent of £64 a year; but as the leases expired this land was divided into portions suitable for occupation by working-men. These pendicles, called locally *pilmuirs*, were twenty-six in number; the largest of them rented at £22, 10s., and the whole of them at £230 a year.' Twenty-six families, instead of two as before, were comfortably provided for by this parcelling of ground. Now if landowners in general acted as this laird did, or followed the examples of Lord Compton, Lord Tollemache, and Lord Shaftesbury, they could solve the land difficulty, and would show the blue blood still in their veins by such a simple execution of their trust. Landowners in the eighteenth century created agriculture and largely developed the wealth and power of the country; their successors in the

Digitized by Google

nineteenth century have utterly ruined it by their mismanagement, niggardliness to the land, and extravagance of life, and have made bankrupt the greatest interest of our nation, dissipating the greatest inheritance that has ever fallen to the lot of men; it may be that with the dawn of the twentieth century they shall, of their own accord, see the evil of extreme monopoly and draw back the people to the country by offering, to as many as desire it, a free choice of cheap land. A judicious development of large estates by feuing at moderate rates, and by wise expenditure of improvements, would bring its own rewards, not only in money value, but in philanthropic and social results so manifold as sooner or later to convince landlords that the policy of expansion is every way more beneficial than that of contraction. Without any act of self-denial on their part they might thus be patriots, and they ought to be, lest a worst thing befall them.

This solution will appear to land reformers as flagrantly improbable as to sober minds projects of nationalisation seem to be flagrantly impracticable. So it may be. If the greater division of land cannot thus be voluntarily effected, and if it is impossible to buy out the landlord, something far more radical will have to be proposed. 'The concentration of land in large estates among a small number of families,' says M. de Laveleye, 'is a sort of provocation of levelling legislation.' With political power rapidly passing to the labourers, and the only question remaining how to turn that power to account, they will use it to improve their advantages, no doubt; and when they come to this conclusion, we may expect something more drastic than the appropriation of 'unearned increment'; the public mind, chafed and provoked by an extreme monopoly of the land, may demand, as the only alternative, nationalisation, root and branch. How, then, would this system, as a second form of land tenure, work? And how would holders under the State be situated? Suppose private ownership turned into public ownership, however that might be brought about—by Revolution or Reform, by confiscation or purchase; suppose the State to become land-

Digitized by Google

lord, and draw the rent, would not this landlord be a thousand times as irresistible as anyone now in being? If rent were not forthcoming, the State would resort to eviction, and it could neither be coaxed nor bullied, neither done out of its rents nor assassinated for taking it. The peasant, as a holder under the State, might come to be in a worse plight than he is at present, and to detest such tenure as leaving him without the first enjoyment in life—a sense of permanent and immovable security. He wants a certainty of food for himself and family. Fear of that want is an element in the Land Question which should never be forgotten; and if, along with it, the magic of property be taken into account, no system of tenure will satisfy all the conditions but one which makes the peasant a freeholder, and places him outside any control, interference, or coercion, except what comes from the forces of Nature. Peasant ownership was adopted by China and India away in the dim past; it exists in Russia, Germany, France, and the United States; it is the goal towards which democracy tends everywhere. Parliament has already done something in this direction. The Allotment Extension Act of 1882 requires trustees of charity lands, under certain specified conditions, to offer portions of land to the labourers. Owing to laziness or ignorance, little good has accrued from passing this Act. The Allotments Act of 1887 goes further, and promises better results. It has stimulated the voluntary supply of allotments, and under the direction of the Rural Labourers' League 10,000 men or more have obtained a piece of land, and several thousands of acres have been assigned to the rural poor. This is but the day of small things, hardly even a beginning in the direction of distributing the land; but there is more than what appears at first sight, for the second Allotments Act contains the good principle that where, in the judgment of a competent public authority, land is necessary, then it shall be taken, with fair compensation, whether the owner wish it or not. This principle, in the light of the great truth that 'all landowners are merely tenants in the eye of law,' is capable of much wider and more thorough-going applications.

Digitized by Google

It must not be confined to miserable acre allotments of the worst land, and at double the rent of the best, nor to the well-known 'three acres and a cow,' but should be extended to ten or fifteen, or thirty or fifty-acre farms, with decent dwellings and corresponding farm offices. By an immense increase of such peasant holdings new capital would be attracted to the land, the productiveness of the soil would be far larger, and the country would be repopulated. The restoration of a peasant proprietary is clearly the best remedial measure that can be thought of, and it is one which legislation encourages, and will likely put more and more into force.

Whatever may be the new tenure, it must be left to grow up of itself. Land reformers indulge in tall talk about their panaceas, and about what the State could and should do. They seem to think that Parliament could not only divide the land, but create a peasant proprietary, with the stroke of a pen. The functions of State control are not so extensive, and if carried thus far would be an interference with liberty and property, and bring in chaos. A more generous tenure cannot be created by Acts of Parliament, but must grow out of manifold changes tending towards it, manifold reforms leading up to it. Under this new tenure, a system of peasant proprietorship may only be half a solution of the land question. To dump down a million of little freeholders on the soil at some one's expense would not mend matters; but if they could take possession in their own way, and when it was convenient, and by means of some fair terminable rental, a stable and satisfactory condition of things would ensue. Still further, this new tenure would, in all likelihood, have to make room for large as well as small farms. The small yeoman disappeared before the larger farmers, as the handloom shops before large factories, and little peasant properties would gladly be absorbed again, unless they were made inalienable by law; but the capitalist farmer, as well as the peasant farmer, must have a place in the new *régime* as an owning cultivator of the soil. Every reasonable facility should be afforded to create small holdings, and yet the distribution of

Digitized by Google

a number of large farms among many small holdings ought not to be regarded as incompatible, but as going with the current of the times, as well as with the traditions of the people. In these directions, and others not yet clear to any of us, the evils of Landlordism may be removed, the common right to the soil vindicated, and grants of small plots at fair rents and on secure possession obtained; and then millions of uncultivated acres would yield fruit, villages would grow in all the natural development of rural life, cottages would be surrounded with vegetable and fruit gardens, and healthy and happy homes would be found in every corner of the land.

In conclusion, our inquiry shows that the Land Question is at the root of all our social wrongs and distresses. The *fons et origo mali* lies here. To it we trace our pauperism, our depopulation of the country, our congestion of the city, our glutted labour market, and our unhealthy housing of the people. It is responsible for those ills in a very large measure. Monopoly in land keeps the labourer at the point of bare subsistence, and warrants the observation that to speak to him of thrift is to fill his belly with the east wind.

The time has gone by for tolerating this state of things, and has come for protesting against the gains of monopoly and privilege. Long enough has the prayer of the common people been—

> 'God bless the Squire and his relations,
> And teach us all to know our stations.'

Long enough have we seen at work the old harsh principle of English law, of siding with the strong against the weak, with man against woman, with landlord against labourer, with capitalist against workman. Happily signs of its breakdown are seen in all directions. Property is sacred, say the landlord and the capitalist classes, and so say we; but the sacredness belongs a thousand times more to its duties than to its rights.

The end contemplated in land reform is national well-being, the greatest good of the greatest number, an equalising of the distribution of wealth. With the replacing of population upon

Digitized by Google

the land, a state of prosperity would appear, of which we know but little at present. The influx of labourers from the country to the town would cease, the produce imported from the Continent and America would be grown at home, save millions, and go to increase general well-being. A country is immeasurably safer, stronger, and more capable of progress, where the many are in comfort and content than where wealth is concentrated. It is, therefore, the duty of Christian men to interest themselves in the solution of the problem. Let Christian preachers declare woe, as Isaiah did of old, on those who monopolise the soil and the fruits of the soil, who fatten on the sweat of impoverished workers and do no work themselves; but that part of their mission might fall into the background in comparison with the urgent duty of studying the subject, and determining to handle it in harmony with righteousness and truth. The plea that it is a very dangerous subject to touch, while enforcing moderation, should not paralyse inquiry, or the purpose manfully and earnestly to grapple with it. Moses and Isaiah did not fear the face of kings, when espousing the people's cause, nor should the prophets of Christ in our time hesitate to show sympathy with the people's questions, or quail before the strong vested rights that will persecute them, if they dare. It is the duty of those who are followers of our Lord and Saviour to be first in all social reforms, and in all unselfish service; first in everything that prevents the decay of manhood, promotes national well-being, and makes the land of our birth a happier place for all.

Digitized by Google

VI.

THE LABOUR QUESTION—I. HOURS.

Canon Scott Holland told the Anglican Conference, held at Folkestone in 1892, 'that the Church was about forty years too late in striking an attitude on the Labour Question,' and the student of Economics finds it easy to explain how difficult it really was at that time for the Church to assume a truly moral attitude. The passion for prosperity, which De Tocqueville notes as a feature in the growth of democracy, had then come into strong play, and found ample means of gratifying itself in the singular Providence which made Great Britain the mart of commerce and the workshop of the world. At a time when the wealth of the nation was advancing by leaps and bounds, it was not easy for the Church to strike in with any notes of warning as to the evils that might accompany this material prosperity, nor does the Church seem to have had ethical insight quick enough to note the tendency of things, and amidst the growing materialism to assert a burning sense of spiritual realities. It was a time when the Gospel of Political Economy, according to the 'Manchester School,' effectively silenced the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Ricardian hypothesis of an 'economic man' as the constant quantity, always pursuing his own pecuniary gain, was the hard-and-fast formula of English economists, which they erected into the ideal of a true and great commonwealth. It left out of account the pliant and perfectible elements—the ethical and spiritual contents of

Digitized by Google

human nature; it laid down laws with regard to profits and wages that have encouraged monopolistic tendencies and class interests; it treated labour as a commodity without caring to understand how the character of man is affected by such treatment; and, worst of all, it became in the hands of conscienceless hangers-on 'an engine for keeping the working classes in their place.'[1] In consequence of this passion for wealth, and the economic lines on which it has been pursued, the course of social evolution has been gradually to build up a permanent monopoly, like that of land, a monopoly of capital which keeps in its own hands the opportunities of industrial enterprise and success, which excludes the producing classes from the possession of capital, and establishes a new subjection, the subjection of workers who have nothing to depend on but precarious wage-labour. Hence the Labour Question, which for complexity and gravity stands next to the Land Question, and on the solution of which the happiness of a wise and understanding people depends.

In the teaching of the new Political Economy there is hope. For it does not regard wealth alone, but the men still more who make it, as the chief factor of the problem. It protests against turning the man into a 'hand' or machine; it will have the man to make capital, but not to have 'capital made out of him,' and then be placed at its mercy; it affirms that real property in the legal sense does not make up the sum of a nation's wealth, but that health, frugality, and capacity have an economic value, that the best returns are not always realised in hard cash, and that the problem of the distribution of wealth cannot be solved without reference to the duties of man and the well-being of society. It is admitted by every economist of note that underpayment of labour results at once in inefficient labour, in diminished power of production, and has, moreover, far-reaching effects in the lowering of industrial stamina for generations.

We are not all agreed as to how the dignity and due rewards

[1] See Marshall's *Principles of Economics.*

Digitized by Google

of labour can be secured, but we are all agreed that the problems connected therewith should be generously solved, and that they will be thus solved, as we realise the truth, no less scientific than Christian, that we are members one of another. The idea of organism, every part for the whole and the whole for every part, affords a key to many of our enigmas, and pervades the simple and sublime morality of Jesus Christ, but we have let it fall too much into abeyance. Happily it is the most resplendent idea at work in the economic transition of our time.

In considering the Labour Question, we must bear in mind that solution lies in promoting the general efficiency of labour, and the general good of the community. In the production of national wealth, it should be our main concern to train intelligent, skilled, and upright men. The strength and greatness of a country depend not on the extent of its commerce or the abundance of its wealth, but on the quality of its work, and that, again, depends on the number of good men and women in it. In the poet's couplet the truth is told—

> 'Ill fares the land, to threatening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.'

Nor do we sympathise with the pessimist view of work, which regards it as a heavy burden, if not a positive curse—a view which the strong passion of pity in our day for some of its unskilled forms largely helps to exaggerate. 'All things are full of labour,' says the wise man. It is a universal law, and its supreme form was seen in Him who said, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' Did not the Carpenter of Nazareth honour the artisans' calling for all time? Has not the Gospel of Work been sounded out by a prophet in our century? Carlyle saw it sturdily pursued in the Ecclefechan homestead, and through all his writings treats it as the greatest of human interests. The labourer does not ask or need our pity. Take him and his toil at their common level, and does he not, in virtue of it, eat and sleep better than the idle man? Has he not better health and more enjoyment of friendship, blessings

Digitized by Google

which the wealthy of our day often seem to lose? Work is right and blessed. Every man should work; if he does not, neither should he eat. There should be no idle class; no class of those who consume, but do not produce; no privileged body allowed to live upon the produce of others' labour without rendering an equivalent.

In all labour the standard of worth should be kept high, and every workman should strive not only to get his living out of it, but to raise it to the highest excellence that can be reached. We desire a long growth of our commerce; this depends on the bulk and mass of labour, still more on upward effort in the nature of that labour itself. And to obviate scamped work, and help the workman to be proud of the integrity of his work, he needs to be protected from the exhaustion of overwork, and adequately rewarded for the work of his hand. Such is the Labour Question in a nutshell. The workman ought to have as much remuneration as will provide sustenance for his family, and as much leisure as will permit him to guide the cultivation of his own mind and the upbringing of his children. 'The liberal reward of labour,' says Adam Smith, 'as it is the necessary effect, so it is the natural symptom of increasing national wealth.' Jevons closes his chapter on the Theory of Labour with this sentence: 'In a regular and constant employment the greatest result will always be gained by such a rate as allows a workman each day, or each week at most, to recover all fatigue, and recommence with an undiminished store of energy.'

Before grappling with the main issues of the Labour Problem, let us notice the two factors in the production of wealth—Capital and Labour. During the last two hundred years the industrial system, known as Capital and Labour, has come into vogue; it did not exist in antiquity, and differs widely from the mediæval guilds which united masters and workmen in kindly relations. An affinity of interest, well-nigh amounting to identity of interest, is conceivable between capitalist and labourer, between employer and employed, in a wise and equitable order of things; but constituted as human nature

Digitized by Google

actually is, these two parties, instead of preserving a close interdependence, may allow their interests to clash with one another, and in this way class-antagonism drives masters and men into hostile camps. Nothing is more natural than for the capitalist to get the services of the common factor with himself at the lowest terms: he will try to obtain labour, and the greatest amount of it, as cheaply as he can. On the other hand, nothing is more natural than for the workman to seek a minimum of work, and a maximum of wage: he will try to obtain as large a share as he can in the surplus profits of industry.

The impartial Christian student of industrial phenomena, while he must judge how far one party has taken advantage of the other, should avoid as much as possible taking sides, and should never give hasty utterance to the passions of the hour. He needs to remember the words of Carlyle: 'I know no better definition of the rights of man—Thou shalt not steal: Thou shalt not be stolen from—what a society were that! Plato's Republic, Moore's Utopia, mere emblems of it! Give every man what is his—the accurate price of what he has done and been—no more shall any complain, neither shall the earth suffer any more.' If both parties could from the outset have done this, the economic relations of Capital and Labour would have observed the law of spontaneous growth, and a fair division of the respective shares due to each would have followed; but, throughout, one may perceive the absence of intelligent self-interest, not to mention a forgetfulness of the Golden Rule: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.'

It is important to ascertain the position of parties that has created and complicated the problem. In the conflict between Capital and Labour, it does not break the law of impartiality to say that the advantage, alike in the struggle and the issue, has lain with the former. Capital, as accumulated wealth, is an enormous power, and as it goes on obeying the law 'to him that hath shall be given,' as it goes on accumulating, it becomes a tremendous power for good or evil. Capital is ever growing

Digitized by Google

and with its increase the means of production and the aggregate of profits will be multiplied indefinitely. Such use of capital in the increase of wealth ought to be hailed as an unmixed good. Everything tends to augment its power in the hands of those who wield it. The instruments of production have been gradually transferred to this class. Machinery has done wonders; the steam power in this country alone is equal to the manual power of the whole human race; but while the introduction of machinery has lightened the heavier kinds of toil, and cheapened goods for the consumer, the profits therefrom have been disproportionally gained by the capitalist. In addition to those advantages, the first Reform Bill threw political power into the hands of this class, and helped on the ascendency of a Capitalist *régime*. Under this *régime* the 'captains of industry' wield a political influence as great as the landowners, and have become the masters of the economic world; under this *régime* the profits of production have been unequally distributed, and in the partnership between Capital and Labour, Capital has had too much and Labour has had too little.

In this contest it is evident that Labour is placed at a disadvantage. Labour must undertake an unequal struggle, since it is without the instruments of production, without machinery, without property. Capital has the power of crushing it by the weight of its own prerogative, of dictating terms to it, and starving it when it will not comply. The workman lives from day to day on what Capital is pleased to grant him; he is more or less its slave, dependent on it as a wage-earner, at its mercy while drawing wages that are always uncertain and changeable. As a consequence of holding this position, Labour has been unfairly used by Capital, and the labourer has been robbed of advantages which by right and equity belong to him. Such is the view taken by close and impartial students in general; it is a profound sentiment growing stronger every day, and appeals to the nation with vivid force in the object-lesson of colossal fortunes side by side with grinding poverty—of a few millionaires at one end of the industrial scale, and millions of poor at

Digitized by Google

the other end. Such are the leading features of the problem; and the cause of discontent cannot be removed until the relationship between Capital and Labour is properly, equitably, and righteously adjusted. Is it possible to discover and apply any principle of co-operation that shall be fair to Capital and fair to Labour alike; that shall recognise the right of the worker, after wages and interest have been paid, to divide with the capitalist the surplus profits that may remain?

The advancement of the industrial interests of the labourer has been almost entirely due to his own exertions, and as these exertions were often accompanied with riots and rick-burnings, public opinion as well as the power of Capital was arrayed against him. In the earlier days of the struggle, the law of settlement prevented the migration of labourers from one place to another in search of work, and the Combination Laws prevented their association to confer about their interests or seek a rise in wages. Combinations of workmen were declared to be illegal, and punishable by imprisonment; and under these laws they were for nearly three centuries doomed to excessive hours of toil and starvation wages. In 1825 the Combination Laws were repealed, and workmen were permitted to come together for the promotion of their welfare; they were for the first time empowered by law to fight for their own freedom of action, so long as they did not use violence, intimidation, or force. From that date the work of organisation commenced, and proceeded with considerable activity. While workmen continued steadily to organise themselves into Trades Unions, they eagerly took part in the agitation for Parliamentary reform; and when they found their position hardly improved by the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, they made their voice heard again in the demand for the Charter. The Chartist movement, from 1838 to 1848, was a fierce struggle of the artisans, marked by many a scene of riot and uproar, not to be wondered at when the state of industrial life in the factories, mines, and workshops of that period is recalled. Engels' *State of the Working Classes in England in*

Digitized by Google

1844, which is largely a reproduction of official documents, gives a woeful tale of cruelty and oppression, and rehearses many cases of workmen who were bound like slaves to fulfil their masters' command, under fear of dismissal and starvation. After the collapse of the Chartist movement, the work of combination went on steadily increasing, and inquiries were made into the objects of Trades Unions, from which it appeared that they were by no means free of the abuses of intimidation and outrage. From 1850 to 1860 rapid strides were made in the organisation of labour, and some great strikes, belonging to this period, fastened public attention on the subject of trade disputes in general. In 1867 a Commission was appointed to inquire into the constitution of Trades Unions, and in 1871 they were recognised by law. Further amendments of the Trade Union Act, carried out in 1876, freed labour from legal disabilities, placed its Unions on a level with all other associations, and gave perfect liberty to pursue its objects without fear. The bulk of what it has gained during the last fifty years it owes to the judicious use of combination, and Unionism has proved such an effective instrument that public opinion now recognises its beneficial tendency, and approves of it so long as it is reasonably and moderately exercised. Workmen have found union to be strength in the way of securing better wages and shorter hours. None grudge the improvement; masters and men alike rejoice over it. As an instrument for advancing the industrial interests of the people, and enforcing the demands of labour as they arise, no better than Trade Unionism has yet been devised. It places the men on a level with the masters, and secures a position which equalises the relative forces of Capital and Labour. A workman, isolated and single, has no chance of making equitable terms with an employer; and if the labour-market be glutted, he is compelled to take work at any price, lest he starve. But when he is a member of a powerful organisation, he is able to make a better bargain, and sell his labour at a fairer price. A Trade Union is strong in proportion to the number of workers enrolled in its

Digitized by Google

membership. If it can draw two-thirds of the entire workers of a trade within its pale, it is a match, and sometimes more than a match, for the party against which it is called to contend. Some of the Unions that can boast of such a vantage-ground are the Amalgamated Engineers, the Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders, and the miners of Northumberland and Durham. As fighting machines, they are so strong in men and material resources as to be prepared for almost any emergency in the industrial world. As an evidence of the staying power of such bodies, it may be mentioned that the Amalgamated Engineers had in 1890 a membership of 67,800, in 1889 an income of £183,651 and an expenditure of £132,642. Although the strong Unions have accumulated large funds, it is satisfactory to know that less than twenty-five per cent. is spent on strikes, while over seventy-five per cent. is expended for benevolent purposes. Large available resources, instead of provoking to industrial war, produce a sense of responsibility, and encourage a spirit of security and moderation. The total membership of Trade Unionism in this country has been carefully estimated as amounting to nearly two millions of work-people; and it is not difficult to perceive that such an army of labour, well organised, animated by a high purpose, and prudently handled, is capable of achieving the greatest ends consistent with reason and justice. Any impartial observer will at once understand and acknowledge that nothing should be done by others, much less by Trades Unions themselves, to undermine those institutions or to prevent them from having an independent and manly future. Trade Unionism is, therefore, to be reckoned as one of the enduring forces of our time, and, on the whole, a force making for good, because it has considerably improved the relations between employers and employed, raised the material and moral conditions of the workers as a class, and, though organised for fighting purposes, holds, in proportion to its solidarity, an important place in securing industrial peace.

The Labour Movement is signalised at the present time by two classes of leaders—the Old Unionists and the New; they

Digitized by Google

have not parted company, because both are still needed to preserve the rights of combination, but they differ considerably in temper, aims, and methods from one another. Among the older men of light and leading, who have borne the heat and burden of the earlier battles, there is a disposition to sit down, and look back on past successes—to rest and be thankful. They appreciate sufficiently the marvellous and beneficent influence of their trade organisations; they remember the period of bitter hatred from the employers, and of scorn from the economists, through which their movement had to pass before it gained a legitimate triumph; they are wont to tell the workmen of Britain what the less thoughtful among them are apt to forget, that they are far ahead in every respect, socially and economically, of every other working class in the world; they dwell on the slow and steady methods that were adopted to promote trade combinations—on the unresting, unhasting spirit, that was needed to effect such enormous advantages; and consequently they are given to teach that nothing can equal the self-reliance of the working classes, and the efficacy of their combinations in carrying forward still further the enfranchisement and the amelioration of labour. In this view of the matter there is much truth, and it would be ungrateful to ignore the labours of the Old Unionists. But the new men of light and leading are not content with the achievements of their predecessors, and still hear the voice which bids them speak to the people that they go forward. The new leaders, impatient of the old, express a louder discontent with the industrial system of to-day, feel more acutely the evils of the system, and advocate more rapid and more drastic measures of reform. In relations so complex and so ill-adjusted as those which subsist between Capital and Labour, it is inevitable that the goal of one generation must be the starting-point of another, until something like perfect equity is reached. So long as labour is kept in uncertainty, so long must it avail itself of every opportunity to strengthen its position, and so long must it strive to eliminate those fluctuations which deprive men, women, and children of

Digitized by Google

every humanising influence, which degrade large sections of the community, and prevent their mental and moral development.

New Unionists differ from the Old mainly in a desire to accomplish by Parliamentary enactment what has hitherto been gained by voluntary action through Trade Unions. It is held by the old leaders as contrary to Trade Union principles that application should be made to Parliament to do for labour what the Unions always asserted labour could do for itself, when freed from the trammels of legal enactment. They do not believe in asking any legislative body to do for men what they can and ought to do for themselves, and stand up for that independence which has done so much in the past, and given to the British workman that stalwartness of character for which he has hitherto been distinguished. They have a feeling, largely justified by the history of trade combination, that the self-reliance and independence, bred of past effort, are greatly preferable to begging the House of Commons to give effect to the just demands of labour. Old Unionists are self-reliant, believe in the organisation of labour, managed by the workers, as sufficient to obtain equitable terms, and therefore strongly urge the workers to abide by this method in seeking shorter hours and better wages. But the New Trade Unionists are not satisfied with this slow method of winning better conditions for labour, and advocate legal restriction and regulation in the achievement of their objects. They demand by legislation what, they affirm, would have to be indefinitely delayed, or not effected at all, if left to voluntary adjustment between masters and men. They are imbued with Socialism, and at one with Socialists in looking forward to the maintenance of the State and to the exercise of an authoritative control over the production and distribution of wealth.

Now it is too late in the day to debate the point of State interference with industrial affairs, since that interference has gone on for years, and will yet be more frequent. We have long ago disqualified ourselves for objecting to State restriction of labour. There are thousands of clauses on the Statute-Book

Digitized by Google

which limit the free industry of adults in all sorts of ways, and for all sorts of reasons. Nor does the objection to State control, that it saps the manly independence of the workers, carry much weight, because the exact reverse has been the case with the operatives of Lancashire and Yorkshire, who have made greater advances in self-reliance and independence during the last fifty years than any other class of English operatives. Statesmen of every party and economists of every school are agreed that the individualism, the unfettered competition, of fifty years ago was scandalous, that there are still conditions which it is in the highest degree desirable to impose on industry, and that only law can afford to every individual a guarantee that his competitors will pursue the same course as to hours of labour, and so forth, without which he cannot safely adopt it himself. They are, therefore, in favour of a cautious and gradual extension of State action, and while not committed to the position of Socialism, that the time is ripe for the transference of production from private to public control, they anticipate that the organisation of industry will fifty years hence be more under State management that it is now.

There is a movement affecting the hours of work and the well-being of the workers, a movement which many of us are thinking of, and shall have to think more of, ere we see the end of it. The demand for shorter hours of work is a great and legitimate interest. Seventy years ago men toiled from ninety to a hundred hours per week. When Christian philanthropists like the Earl of Shaftesbury agitated for a ten-hours day, this restriction of time was long and zealously opposed by the manufacturers, who asserted that it would deprive them of all margin of profit and lead to a fall of wages, and by economists who demonstrated that the successful running of the mill depended entirely on the 'last hour'; but the last hour has been twice reduced, and neither trade nor wages have suffered. Every one knows that Factory legislation is one of the most blessed chapters in our history. It has saved our working population, and enabled us to command the industrial supremacy

Digitized by Google

of the world. And with the growth of self-respect among the workers the demand for an eight-hours day seems to increase on every side. When that demand is judged, upon moral and religious grounds, it is a good and desirable object, it is a right thing to aim at. Men should have leisure—time to read, and time to enjoy family life. The nation's money is spent in public schools, in stirring the germs of interest in science and literature, and what is the inevitable outcome of this education? Labour realises at last that it has dignity, and the right as well as the duty to cultivate it. The poorest workman should have time for self-improvement, if he is more than a machine or beast of burden; to spend twenty-four hours in work, food-taking, and sleep, without leisure or family life, that is the life of an ox. If he labour from 6 A.M. to 6 P.M., and do effective work, he wears himself out early, and is disinclined for higher pursuits; with nine hours he is much better off; but if he is not to be merely subservient to the making of wealth, and himself is of more value than the steel or cotton goods he turns out, then undoubtedly he should have the control of so much time as highest interests require. To save men from overwork, and its degradation, is a religious duty, and ought to be adequately vindicated in every way. Judged by this rule, the Church, with its Christian Gospel, has something to say on a burning question of the hour—the eight-hours movement. From the ethical standpoint, it joins with enlightened opinion in teaching that there are few trades in which a person can, with advantage to himself and the community, be actually working hard for more than eight hours a day; it declares the increased leisure to be a benefit, not a loss, and the obligation to use it well a Christian duty. If used to promote the vigour physically, mentally, and morally of the present generation and the next, it would be an absolute gain; and it is generous to suppose that the working classes would utilise this additional leisure creditably to themselves and profitably to the State.

While eight hours a day in most trades may be counted a reasonable minimum, and Mr. Giffen stated to the Labour

Digitized by Google

Commission that in many trades it was proving itself to be the time in which the first and best product was obtainable from the worker, it is quite another affair to say that it should at once be converted into a maximum in all trades. A hundred considerations of the utmost nicety arise at this point. Does not this demand look like an unjust restriction of free industry? What business has any outsider to prescribe the terms on which men are to be employed? Is a workman to get for eight hours the wage he gets for nine? If not, will he relish the loss of an hour's pay? Or is the loss to fall on the consumer by increasing the cost of articles produced? Will overtime be prohibited? If not, the eight-hours day would be a dead letter. Is it not a device to raise wages rather than shorten hours, by allowing workmen to begin overtime, with extra pay, at the ninth instead of the tenth hour? Will this reduction of working hours make room for the unemployed, and tend to equalise work among the many instead of the few? Such are some of the dilemmas that need to be looked at in all their bearings, and thoroughly cleared up, before the demand for an eight-hours day in any department of industry can be conceded.

The question of hours has been well threshed out, and many difficulties and fears have been removed. The experience of gradually diminishing the hours of labour has been going on in many trades for two generations, and shows conclusively that it is possible to go on without diminishing the output, wages, or profits. It is said that the result would be to cause Great Britain to lose her hold of the markets of the world. Gloomy prophecies for the economical future of this country accompanied the reduction of the normal working day at the passing of the Factory Acts, and therefore less heed is now paid to jeremiads about capital taking wings and flying from our shores. Although grave doubts are felt by some about work being found for the unemployed, in consequence of this curtailment of working hours, it is an obvious fact that every nine men who work only one extra hour per day keep one other man idle; and still further, in not a few trades, where expensive machinery is used,

Digitized by Google

employers and employed might equally gain, by so readjusting hours, that two sets of men could labour for eight hours each instead of one set of men for nine hours. The same reasons for an eight-hours day justify the abolition of overtime, for the continuance of which blame must be equally distributed between masters and men. The masters cannot wish it, for it is expensive, and the men are not materially benefited by the extra pay, and must in time injure their health. With an eight-hours day, and overtime greatly curtailed, if not abolished, there ought to be employment for those who are out of work. Public opinion is almost unanimous that the working hours should be reduced, and the only difference now existing is as to the method. We are all agreed as to the end, but differ as to the means. Shall an eight-hours day be a legal and compulsory enactment, or a free and voluntary arrangement? Shall it be obtained by law or trade-union effort? Or shall the machinery of legislative interference and the machinery of mutual agreement be employed together? In most of our colonies an eight-hours day prevails, but in none of them is it by law, but only by custom; and sagacious counsellors, who deprecate any wanton damage to our industrial stability, look to firm organisation for an eight-hours limit. Such an instrument is recommended as preferable to an Act of Parliament, because reliance on the State is apt to undermine self-reliance. No doubt, there is sound wisdom in such a view, and if Capital and Labour took friendly counsel together as to how an eight-hours limit could be reached, that would be a more excellent way, and a better policy than repeating the course of the Factory Acts, which were supported by the operatives, opposed by the masters, and fought to the bitter end in the House of Commons.

During the last two or three years, under the leadership of the New Unionists, who are the aggressive party of the Labour hosts, and with the aid of public opinion, the eight-hours movement has passed from the academic haunts of discussion into the region of practical politics. At the Trades Union Congress, held in Liverpool in September 1890, the advocates

Digitized by Google

of a 'legal eight-hour' day succeeded in carrying their resolution, but when the Bill to secure it was issued in February 1891, not a single Labour Member would undertake responsibility for it in the House of Commons, and only one name was on the back of it. In 1892 an Eight Hours Bill for miners was defeated by a majority of 110; in 1893 it was carried by a majority of 78. It would be difficult to find in the whole history of Parliament a more dramatic instance of the growth of opinion. The adoption of the eight-hours principle by statesmen belonging to both the great parties, and the fact of its being chiefly opposed by the *laissez faire* politicians, are a guarantee of its soon passing into law. Five-sixths of the miners in the United Kingdom desire this legislative shortening of the hours, and any opposition among them comes from the Northumberland and Durham men, who work between seven and eight hours, and make the boys work ten. Such a notable victory ought to create a deep impression on employers and employed; it should lead to friendly conferences among them, and to some rational and voluntary adjustment of prevailing difficulties. It would be wholly good, if that result were produced; and then instead of dividing about methods, the friends of Labour might approve of the one as well as the other.

At the Miners International Conference, held in Brussels in May 1893, the principle of a legal eight-hours day was affirmed by 994,000 against 100,000, the minority being North of England men, and by the same majority it was decided that if the various Parliaments refused the eight-hours limit, a general strike should be declared to obtain it. Public sympathy and support go with the miners, for they cannot work with health and safety for more than eight hours at the bottom of a mine; but when they propose a general strike to achieve their object, they propose a civil war, and will not be backed in such a course by the community. Instead of guiding their movement wisely amid the breakers, they would blindly drive it on to ruin. Such a strike was attempted in Australia

Digitized by Google

where labour was most strong, and Unionism was so successful, yet it fell with such completeness as greatly to damage the Labour cause in Australia, and cripple it for many years to come. The miners of Great Britain, though well organised, could not undertake or carry out such a general strike, while their brethren on the Continent have not so much as won the elementary right to organise themselves.

Digitized by Google

VII.

LABOUR QUESTION—II. WAGES.

THE Labour Question is one which seeks and finds solution, not only in diminishing the hours of labour, but likewise in increasing the rewards of labour. It is right for workmen to have an equitable share of the fruits of industry, and to use every means justified by honour of getting a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Our Christian Gospel is saturated with such teaching, and lays it down as a first principle that 'the husbandman who laboureth must be the *first* to partake of the fruits.' 'He that plougheth ought to plough in hope, and he that thresheth to thresh in hope.'

As a question of wages, Turgot puts the difficulty as he found it in the eighteenth, and we still find it at the end of the nineteenth century: 'The simple working man, who has only his two hands, possesses nothing unless he is able to sell his labour to others. He may sell it cheap or dear, but the price, more or less high, does not depend on himself alone; it is the result of the bargain he makes with his employer. This latter pays as little as he can, and since he can choose from among a vast number of labourers he prefers the one who will work at the lowest rate. The labourers are thus obliged to lower their prices in competition with one another. In every kind of labour it must therefore result, and such is actually the case, that the wages of the labourer are limited to the exact amount necessary to keep him alive.' If two or three

Digitized by Google

employers want a workman, he is in a position to ask what wage he likes, and will get it; but if two or three workmen ask work from an employer, he has the advantage, and will hire his man at the cheapest possible rate. Such is the great economic law of supply and demand, but it must be apparent that it acts unnaturally and oppressively, the one way or the other, unless it be set on the basis of the ethic law of what is due alike to employer and employed.

In the struggles of Labour, history shows that wages have been too low, as a rule, to allow saving, and that wages have been kept down by an overstocked labour-market. The poor toiler has been robbed because he is poor, and advantage has been taken of competition for a mere subsistence to use a large part of his service and give him nought for his work. The slave of antiquity had no freedom, yet he was well fed and well housed; the serf of the Middle Ages worked two or three days on the land of his lord, and the rest of the time on his own, and had a good deal of give and take with his superior; but the wage-earner, who came on the scene about the sixteenth century, and arose out of the surplus population driven off the land into towns, though he was a freeman, did not own the instruments of production. Economically, therefore, he was little better off than the slave of antiquity or the serf of the Middle Ages, when he had to place himself at the disposal of those who had the means of production for the sake of a livelihood. A minimum is the level towards which competition forces down wages, and this tendency has always made the worker's share of the profits unstable, and more or less insecure. The amount of profit taken by the master out of the workman, perhaps, will never be precisely fixed, but unquestionably the workman has not in this century obtained his share of the fruit of his labour. Nor is the object-lesson in proof of our statement a dubious matter; it stands out conspicuous in the eyes of the nation and the world. Great Britain is great in wealth and great in poverty. Wealth has increased fabulously among us within the last two generations, and a considerable

Digitized by Google

rise in wages has helped to raise the standard of comfort among the upper grades of labour, yet disparities of condition between one class and another are greater and more glaring now than in any period of the world's history. Never was Dives so rich, or Lazarus so poor. Why are 200,000 Glasgow producers of wealth paid so small a proportion of the wealth they produce that they are obliged to rent one-room houses and live in surroundings that prevent decency, morality, and health; that cause eighty-two per cent. of their children to die before they are five years old; and that abridge their lives to an average of twenty-five years, as compared with an average of fifty years for the upper classes? That so vast a sum of wealth as £700,000,000 should be annually appropriated in England by a favoured few, while myriads of toilers struggle for bare existence,—here is a state of matters which no lover of his country can look on with pleasure. Such vast accumulations of wealth at one pole of society, and such vast accumulations of poverty at the opposite pole, afford such contrasts as to be a disgrace to our Christianity. Such a spectacle carries home to every one who thinks of it the conviction that wages have not risen in proportion to wealth, and that the enormous share of profits taken by the few, while the many by whose labour huge fortunes are piled up still remain in crushing poverty, is the tap-root of the evils that distract the industrial world. The partition of wealth is perilous alike to those who have and to those who want, and therefore it is not surprising that those who want should accentuate, as they do with louder insistence, their resolution to have from the products of labour enough to make life worth living.

When we come into closer dealing with the question of wages, we encounter obstacles of very serious complexity in the way of fair and perfect distribution. It is an extremely delicate process to fix the value of the hours of labour. Karl Marx, in his book on Capital, advances a theory of wages that is original and inexorable on the principles formulated by such masters of Political Economy as Adam Smith and Ricardo.

Digitized by Google

If the premiss laid down in the *Wealth of Nations* be granted, that Labour is the sole source and measure of value, he easily demonstrates that Labour is defrauded of its reward, and that Capital is nothing but spoliation; yet every one knows that however much Labour determines value, Capital furnishes the means of production, and is therefore entitled to a share of the profits, besides remuneration for risks and superintendence. Viewing Capital and Labour as closely-allied factors in production—in the creation and partition of wealth—we may state a few general considerations on which both parties will probably agree in regard to the fruits of industry. It lies with the owner of capital to bring his saved or inherited portion into the market; he provides raw materials, factories, tools, in a word, machinery or money. It lies with the workman to bring his labour-force into the market, and offer it for a price. Labour is his capital—a living force without which Capital would be dead. In the coalescence of these two factors we find the means of production, and clearly each of them is entitled to an equitable share of the industrial result. The capitalist must have his proportion due to him for providing implements, organising and directing labour, and undertaking commercial projects on a great scale, only possible to large capitals. He may adopt various methods of augmenting profit—for example, by increasing the number of men and having two shifts, by lengthening the hours of labour and lessening the duration of what economists term 'necessary labour,' or getting workmen to make more articles in the hour. By such methods he may profit himself, and at the same time do fairly to the workman. On the workman's part, he owes a portion of his labour to reward his employer for the use of machinery and the care of superintendence; he must pay his master for these things by so many hours of the working day. There are still the obligations of earning a decent livelihood for himself and family, and as much more as will make life dignified. A few hours' work each day given to the master for lending the instruments of industry, a few hours more to obtain food,

Digitized by Google

clothing and shelter, and a few hours still remaining to better income, or be used in self-improvement,—such may be taken as a fair, an ideal, apportionment of the fruits of labour. But when the ideal has to be realised, and in the face of opposite interests, endless complication arises. Are six or seven hours enough for the first two objects? How many hours will pay the master his due; or must whole twelve hours of the day be given to meet every object? Exceedingly delicate questions these are to settle, and we do not pretend to settle them. They belong to a sphere in which, if moral sentiment prevail, there will be occasion, and need still, for the exercise of a fine Christian equity, but in which, if moral sentiment be wanting, there will be ample opportunity for gross injustice. That injustice has reigned there in the past may be allowed by most of us, and even that something of injustice still exists. We do not say, as Karl Marx puts it, that in six hours the labourer renders an equivalent for his subsistence, and therefore the employer, who has him bound for twelve hours, gains six hours beyond the 'necessary labour.' Such reasoning may have applied to the condition of labour on the Continent, but in this country the concessions that have been made from time to time in the way of diminishing the hours, and increasing the rewards, of labour, make such reasoning inept and out of date. Adjustments as to work and wages have brought matters so much within the lines of equity that there is some force in the statement often made—oftener made, no doubt, than to be always accepted—that the claim to a division of profits may be pushed so far as to destroy the industrial capacity of the nation, upon which the power of paying wages depends.

The contention still remains, however, and it is the crux of the Labour Question, that Capital has taken the first and largest share of profit, with an acknowledged tendency to increase its takings till Labour is left with bare subsistence; while Christian equity, strong for the common good, declares that 'the labourer must be the *first* to partake of the fruits.' If Labour had the first share, and, if it had not the largest, yet the fairest share, it

Digitized by Google

is certain that Capital could never be, as it has been, the master —often the autocrat—of Labour, but only the respected manager and highly-remunerated servant of Labour; it is certain, at least, that such a phenomenon as a millionaire could not exist. The sentiment of the community approaches more and more to the view that there is something wrong in the industrial system, which turns out enormous fortunes for a favoured class, while the mass of toilers who help to make such fortunes are liable to irregular work and inadequate hire. In presence of such unequal appropriations, Labour feels that it has not got its own, and must therefore strive for a better share of the good things of life. Apart from that consideration, however, an improvement of wages does not of necessity diminish the profits of the employer; and, in showing the economic soundness of this statement, we do not need to entangle ourselves with the abstract formulas of the schools. Giffen's or Booth's statistics are worth volumes of theory about 'the equalisation of demand and supply,' 'the measure of value,' and 'the iron law of wages.' The price of labour is determined by the standard of living in the workman's family, which should tend upwards; and if the capitalist would but understand it, the successful use of capital is to be found in a general and permanent rise of wages. Such a rise means increased consumption, and therefore increased demand. This demand causes further supply, and the only way of increasing supply is by the use of more capital. Highly-priced labour comes in the end to be the cheapest by the creation of new employments to meet the increased demand, and so the future of the Labour Question lies in concentrating capital on a larger scale to the increase of wages and a rise of the standard of living.

Careful observation shows that permanent injury is done to the labouring classes by a fall of wages in lowering their standard of comfort, and that their efficiency is increased by high wages, while such increase does not impair the growth and power of Capital. A study of such an industrial problem as the great Dock Strike of 1889 in the Port of London brings out

Digitized by Google

this fact, and proves it to be full of hope for the future. Many prophesied that if the dockers obtained a rise of wages, it would ruin the already impoverished companies, and drive away trade from the Port, but neither of these results has followed. The sixpence an hour was conceded: the average earnings that formerly ranged from seven shillings to nine shillings are said to range now from thirteen shillings to eighteen shillings a week. The old contract system, with its abuses of bribery and direct encouragements to bad work and idleness, has been swept away, better organisation of labour has been introduced, and better relations have been arrived at between the labourers and employers. What has been the result? Mr. Booth's figures, given before the Labour Commission in January 1893, show an increase of five hundred in the number of regularly employed, as compared with the number before the strike; competition is not so keen or so driving as it used to be; the position of the dock labourer has been improved; and one of the dock companies informed its shareholders that the new arrangements had reduced expenditure by £76,000.

And what is the method by which this happy result has been secured, and such results may be still looked for in the future? It is by the power of combination, that the workers succeed in gaining a better proportion of the profits of industry. Union is to the labourer what money is to the capitalist, and it enables him to place wages on a surer footing, because it brings pressure to bear on the opposite interest. That pressure may, at times, have been harsh and tyrannical, but in the main, and as a general rule, it has won for the labouring man a more worthy measure of hire. It has been his best weapon, almost his only weapon, in competition with the formidable power of Capital; and experience plainly teaches that, if he is to obtain the objects that still lie before him, combination must be carried forward still further. Every year witnesses the labour hosts uniting themselves, shoulder to shoulder, in the struggle for more adequate rewards. Nothing strikes an observer of the signs of the times so much as the solidarity of life and interest among the

Digitized by Google

workers—the federation of Labour on a scale of unexampled magnitude. Think of its international scale, as represented by the miners of Great Britain and the Continent, met together in Brussels, to consider the best way of securing an eight-hours working-day, Unionism in this way securing a recognition of the principle of brotherhood where even the Christian Church itself has failed, and proving by an organised system the whole world to be one. Other measures have been, and still are, resorted to by workmen for getting better wages, such as strikes, the terrible and destructive results of which, however, ought to make every Trade Union pause, and have long patience, before appealing to such an arbitrament. Strikes do not indicate completeness of organisation, but often the reverse; and it is often the new unions, full of vitality, but apt to overrate their strength, that are guilty of rushing to this violent extreme. Leaders of the New Unionism, such as Ben Tillett, John Burns, and Tom Mann, though they have used it largely as a fighting machine, are in the habit of showing a great deal more chariness than the men in entering upon a strike, because they know the suffering and starvation it brings to the worker's family, and only some loss of income to the master, with but a dubious gain to their own side. Take any typical strike, from the first Labour conflict at Rome under Spartacus in the year 72 B.C., down through serf revolts and peasant wars to the furious fight between the Unionist workmen of the Carnegie iron-works at Homestead and Pinkerton's body of armed mercenaries, and learn what a tale of horror it is. In this year of grace, 1893, occurred a typical strike of seven weeks' continuance at Hull, where all the evils, characteristic of such struggles, appeared. Some may sympathise with one side or the other, but those whose sympathies are still more with the right could not fail to be saddened by what took place in Hull. Capital and Labour met there in a tremendous tug of war. The Shipping Federation, representing seven-eighths of the shipping of the United Kingdom, stood at the back of the shipowners and dock-proprietors of the great Humber Port, while the Labour

Digitized by Google

organisations of the kingdom strained their resources to the utmost in behalf of the strikers. We do not pretend to say which was in the wrong—very often both are; in trade disputes the bitterness arises as often from trivial as from substantial causes. Whatever the occasion of the strike may have been, the real cause could be traced to a notice issued by the British Labour Exchange two or three weeks before the strike, addressed to working men in the following terms: 'The employers of labour in connection with the docks and shipping at Hull have determined, in order to facilitate the conduct of the Port, in employing labour in future, to give preference to men who are registered at the British Labour Exchange.' This Exchange is a weapon of the Shipping Federation, avowedly used for the purpose of resisting the New Union methods of coercion, and Hull was evidently fixed upon as the battle-ground of an attack upon Unionism. Free labourers were brought into the town to take the place of the Union men, and picketing, a legal practice, but apt to be abused, was set in motion. So long as moral suasion is employed, without resort to violence and intimidation, Trade Unionists may go among the Non-Union workmen, put the case before them, and persuade them to clear out of the way; but when free labourers go about from port to port to break down what Trade Unions have won after many a great sacrifice, and many a long struggle, honourable men will have scant sympathy for such traitors to their own order; it is little wonder that such 'blacklegs' and 'scabs,' as they are termed, should provoke the Union men to fierce wrath, and less wonder still that in the thick of the internecine feud the temperate method of picketing should degenerate into the rough expedient of terrorism and crime.

On the other hand, the masters claimed full liberty to employ whom they liked, and would not be dictated to by Trade Unions, as to whom they should and whom they should not engage; they were battling for the right to manage their own business in their own fashion, and they set the issue before the public that either they must place the control of their

Digitized by Google

business at the mercy of the dockers' delegates, or else they must secure a certain number of local men on whom they can rely in cases of unreasonable demands and boycotting. For these reasons free men were imported into Hull to get the boycotted vessels discharged, and then on the 10th of April the dockers in a body went on strike. As the strike continued, the forces of the Crown were called in to keep the peace, and a company of Lancers paraded the streets, much to the annoyance of the strikers as well as the townspeople; acts of personal violence here and there spread panic through the town; a mob of ruffians armed with iron bars and bludgeons attacked a 'free' ship and desperately resisted the police; a great fire broke out, which the people of Hull thought to be the work of incendiaries, and strongly suspected that these incendiaries were strikers.

Picture a great strike like this in its fiercest light. Mr. Wilson, fortified by the York meeting of the Shipping Federation, declined to take the advice of the House of Commons' Committee, assumed an irrevocable position, and rather than depart from it threatened to desert Hull, and ruin its trade,—such was the attitude of the master millionaire towards the men by whose sweat of brow he had grown so rich! The men, looking on at the conflagration which did so much damage, would not give a hand's turn, though they were offered seven shillings and sixpence an hour for doing so, but proceeded to cut the hose of the engine at work putting out the fire. Here was Capital acting in proud defiance, and dignifying it by the name of rights, and here was Labour standing by in sullen refusal while the great fire spread havoc around. These were the instincts of savagery playing worse havoc in civilised men.

After seven weeks of strife and misery, this unfortunate quarrel ended in a compromise, the men having yielded to work with free labourers, and the employers having yielded the preferential position of free labourers in the docks over Union men. If the imposition of the Federation ticket was an insidious attempt to put aside the organised workers, and

Digitized by Google

produce a collapse of their Union—a charge made by the men, but denied by the masters—such tactics well deserved to be frustrated; for nothing would be more mischievous than to throw back the toilers into the serfdom out of which Unionism has lifted them. At the same time, the freedom of contract which gives the master a right to employ whom he likes—Union men or Non-Union men—cannot be gainsaid; and if any Trade Union disputes that right, it enters upon a coercive policy which deserves to be resisted, and which Capital is quite able to resist. For the Hull strike shows, what the great strike in Australia had shown before, that Capital, when well organised, is able to successfully resist the demands of Labour. Strikes are, therefore, no remedy for adjusting Labour difficulties. They often do nothing but harm all round; they inflict terrible suffering on the poor, destroy much valuable property, and seriously injure the trade of the country.

If this rude arbitrament of war brings no deliverance to the Labour party, where are they to look for it? Strikes generally come of imperfect organisation. If the Hull Dockers Union had been an older body, and more highly organised, the strike would not have been so rashly precipitated, and might never have happened. Much is lost by strikes, but whatever Labour has gained it owes to combination; and therefore strikes ought to be as much discouraged as Unionism ought to be encouraged by the friends of Labour. The latter represents yet only one or two out of seven millions skilled and unskilled workers, and holds in its battalions the pick of the Labour hosts; the one fact shows how confederated action is still in its infancy, while the other shows how the federation of Labour adds to the true economic wealth of the nation in energy, talent, manual skill, physical, mental, and moral endowment. Organised Labour is strong enough to compel a rate of wages sufficient to secure a certain recognised standard of comfort, but so long as an overstocked labour-market gives Capital such an enormous advantage in trade disputes, the Labour Question will be with us. For the greatest difficulty Unionism has to meet is

Digitized by Google

that for every twenty men wanted there are one hundred waiting for the particular job. Men have, therefore, no alternative but to run the risk of being ground down to starvation wages, or resist this state of things by the use of collective strength. But combination is a weapon which masters as well as men may use, and, as things now are, must use. Organisation and counter-organisation are inevitable in the present militant attitude of the Labour Question, but such movements will rather tend to the settlement of industrial disputes. Experience proves that they occur less frequently as both sides near completeness of federation. The federation of employers can be easily effected, and it has not only the advantage of enormous capital to carry on the contest, but the further advantage of drawing upon a great mass of free labour. So long as a large body of workmen exists outside the pale of Unionism, the masters will make use of it, and in any serious strike will come off victorious. It is the duty, therefore, of Trade Unions to extend and perfect their organisation. The sooner they abolish the free labourer, by drawing him into their ranks, the better will they be matched with the contending interest; strikes will end less disastrously, or never need to take place; and the conditions of labour will be more widely improved. Further combination is necessary to prevent one man from underselling his fellows in the labour-market. This work of organising proceeds apace, and, if it goes on at the present rate, soon the power of Labour will be so great that it is not likely to be satisfied with the equal voice to which it is entitled, but to aim at preponderance and even oppression itself. We can only pray that the possession of power, that has often corrupted the judgments of men in the past, will not corrupt the judgments of the people; and heartily do we echo the words of our veteran and venerable statesman to the toilers of the nation: 'You will have the temptation near you, when you become supreme to such a degree, that there is no other power to balance or counteract the power which you possess. You have to preserve the balance of your mind and character, and even if you become, and when

Digitized by Google

you have become, stronger than the capitalist, stronger than the peerage, stronger than the landed gentry, stronger than the great mercantile classes; when you have become in one sense their political masters, you have still before you one achievement to fulfil, one glory to attain, and to appropriate to yourselves—continue to be just.'

When that day of the workers shall arrive we cannot tell, but meanwhile Capital and Labour, though closely allied and indispensable the one to the other in great works of industry, are still separate interests, not only competing but conflicting, and the conflict does not abate but wax in determination as the workers become better educated, and the normal standard of comfort rises among them. It is impossible for anyone who loves his country not to be deeply anxious that this destructive kind of civil war should cease, and that some agreement should be secured whereby commerce might continue to thrive, and the fearful waste of good feeling and well-being among the two parts of the nation might be brought to an end. 'Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the sons of God.' Nothing is more desirable than some kind of mediation between conflicting interests, and therefore Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration have been proposed as effective methods of attaining industrial peace. Such Boards, consisting of a representative from each side, with some leading citizen for an impartial outsider to give the casting vote, might invite the disputing parties to a friendly conference, and by acting before feelings of irritation and soreness are engendered, they might adjust labour difficulties without fighting them out to the bitter end. Abstractly considered, that mechanism seems to be just the kind of intervention required, and as a matter of fact some form of it has for years been successfully at work in the hosiery trades of Nottingham, Leicester, and Derby; in the lace trades in Nottingham; in the manufactured iron trades of the North of England and South Staffordshire; and in the coal trades of Durham and Northumberland.[1] There is little doubt that if

[1] Price's *Industrial Peace.*

Digitized by Google

employers and employed could be induced to make a trial of such Boards of Arbitration and Conciliation, this method of adjusting difficulties would substitute calm argument for impassioned warfare, and prevent a vast amount of suffering and loss; but the parties chiefly in dispute have not shown any genuine goodwill for it. Besides the miserable class jealousies that so often wreck any private attempt to establish such a court of mediation, public opinion differs on the question whether this Court should be a State-established or voluntary Board, whether the one or the other would be a solution of the difficulty. Bills have been introduced into Parliament, laying upon County Councils, or on Chambers of Commerce along with Trades Councils, the duty of constituting Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration; but compulsory reference of trade disputes to such Boards is opposed, on the general ground that the less legislation has to do with the matter the better, and on the special ground that both parties are seldom willing to arbitrate, and rarely have confidence in the arbitrators. Mr. Mundella, President of the Board of Trade, has introduced into Parliament the Labour Disputes Arbitration Bill, a tentative measure, elastic in its provisions and voluntary in its operation. At the time of introducing this Bill, he had an opportunity of trying how such a Board would work by the unofficial appointment of a House of Commons' Committee to hasten a settlement of the Hull dispute. It was a competent and impartial tribunal, and the men professed themselves ready to abide by its decision. The two Wilsons seemed equally ready to accept the scheme of arrangement proposed by Mr. Mundella's committee, but the Shipping Federation intervened to put aside that arrangement, and then Messrs. Wilson stoutly refused to have any further consultation with the Board of Conciliators. In the present coal strike—the greatest on record, including nearly half a million men—the masters proposed to submit the dispute to arbitration, but the National Federation of Miners scouted the idea. To appoint such a Board, and get from it fair terms of compromise, without

Digitized by Google

any power of enforcing them, is plainly of no use till both parties are so amicably disposed that mediation at all is unnecessary. The practical value of any State, or semi-State, tribunal, is almost rendered *nil* when we consider how Mr. Mundella and the gentlemen of the House of Commons were set aside by the Shipping Federation. It must be evident that the principle of arbitration, however excellent and Christian it seems to be, has little chance of gaining any extensive application or becoming more applicable by legislative arrangements for the exercise of voluntary effort.

Others hope to bring about sound industrial conditions by means of Profit-Sharing and Co-operation. Since men have come to see that the monopoly of profit by Capital is as mischievous as the corn monopoly, and that a larger amount of the fruits of work should come into the hands of the workers, many advocate the scheme of Profit-Sharing or Industrial Partnership, according to which the firm not only agrees to give workmen the full market wages, but likewise a direct share in the profits that may be made above a certain fixed minimum. Sedley Taylor's book on *Profit-Sharing* gives a full exposition of the merits of this system, showing by argument and illustration how it could be adopted without any diminution of profits to the employer, because the workers attracted by it would be men of more than average skill and industry, and would unite with the masters in saving machinery. Increased efficiency of work under the stimulus of part-ownership, or by the addition to wages of a certain share in the profits—this is held by writers like Laveleye to be the best solution of the Labour Question; and Professor Marshall asserts that by adopting this system, the relations between employers and employed are, as a rule, raised to a higher plane both economically and morally. Profit-sharing experiments have met with considerable success in France—witness the shining example of the Maison Leclaire; and some think that if Trade Unions were to pronounce emphatically in their favour, many employers might be induced to give them a fair trial, and, if they succeeded, agree to their

Digitized by Google

general adoption. But the employers are chary of the scheme even though it guarantees to them the ordinary profits of the business; and the workmen look upon it as a sort of paternal despotism, less able to meet the difficulties of the wage system than is done by combination; while the fundamental idea of Profit-sharing, viz., that the men will, by additional skill and energy, create the additional profit, condemns it as a solution of the wage difficulty; and John Burns, one of the Labour leaders, pronounces that condemnation in the judgment that 'profit-sharing is nothing less than a delusive bait on the part of capitalists to goad the worker on to greater intensity of toil.' Mr. Giffen has pointed out that many firms make no profit, or only minimum profits, and are often compelled by the competition of others to reduce wages till labour receives in wages and profits what it receives from other firms in wages alone.

As to the system of Co-operation, it has been advocated by some of the best men of this century, and urged by eminent economists as the only method of emancipating the workers, and securing to them the full reward of labour. Another chapter is devoted to this subject, and the reader is referred to it. Meanwhile, it may be said that the Co-operation looked to as the escape for the working classes out of the wage difficulty does not signify the store system, but the association of workmen for promoting industrial enterprises with capital of their own, or lent to them. It seeks to place the three factors of production—capital, labour, and engineering ability—in the same hands; it seeks to displace the individual capitalist by making the workmen their own capitalist; it seeks to divide the fruits of labour among the associated labourers according to the amount and value of the work done by each. To secure these ends and obtain for the workman all the profits of the private employer—such is, undoubtedly, a generous ideal; but fifty years of working at this Co-operative Gospel have not brought us within sight of the Promised Land—a Co-operative Commonwealth. Co-operation has not yet succeeded in overcoming the three main difficulties adverse to the attainment of its ideal;

Digitized by Google

it has not aggregated sums of capital necessary to large undertakings, nor has it associated bodies of men into a good mutual understanding and due regard for established authority, nor has it acquired the requisite talent for the management of business, and the practical sagacity to pay it well. It has done comparatively nothing to displace the present system of employment—to modify or restrain the individualistic, competitive keenness of modern industry. There still prevails through the land the middle-class ideal of a state of things in which Capital reigns supreme, attracting all profit to itself, and sternly repressing, in the name of economic science and of law, all attempts of the workers to secure their economic independence, and raise their condition by Combination and Co-operation. Capitalism—the individualism of privileged wealth—has its foot on the workers; while the wealth, in which it is so powerfully entrenched that nothing as yet has been able to shake it, has been largely created by the productive activity of these workers. In any system that is conformable to justice and right, in any *régime* of industry that is conducive to general welfare, Capital ought to be subordinate to Labour, putting the requisites of production into the hands of the worker, giving the soil to the cultivator, and the machine to the artisan, and letting him have the entire product as the just reward of labour. How to adjust the system of industry on a large scale, and to a widely-distributed end, is the problem to be solved. The manifest impotence and sterility of attempts hitherto to bring about a better *régime* by Courts of Arbitration and Conciliation, and by schemes of Industrial Partnerships and Co-operative Societies, only add to the complexity and embarrassment of the situation, and almost drive us to despair of any reasonable and peaceful solution. Whether the Co-operative movement will in the future win the business of manufacture from the Capitalist *régime*, or whether a union of the forces of Combination and Co-operation will accelerate the predominance of Labour over Capital—these are questions we discuss further on.

It is evident, however, that things cannot remain as they

Digitized by Google

are. With the rise of an educated prolétariat, and the awakenment of the industrial classes to a consciousness of their power, there is no one but has a deep concern for the issue. They are dissatisfied with a doctrine of supply and demand, whose operations surfeit a few and starve the multitude; they have learned that so long as money continues to be the master and not the servant of labour, the temptation of making profit at the expense of wages will remain; they see that social and industrial systems are not permanent, but have been created for the aggrandisement of those who had the power. Slavery, serfdom, feudalism, wage-earning,—all these transitions but prophesy still further changes; they teach us that wage-labour may as inadequately set forth the connection of man with man in the production of wealth as any of the forms which preceded it. The present industrial system is not an ultimate, but transient, element in modern sociological development, yet though in the form of unrestricted individualism it is generally condemned it will not die until a better order takes its place.

In addition to Trade Unionism and Co-operation, a third factor is likely to play an important part in the Labour movement of the future. Political power has passed, and is rapidly passing, into the hands of the industrial orders, and they are bent on using it to accomplish their aspirations. They aim at making their cause prevail in Parliament, and through all the channels of constitutional authority and power. Already a strong Labour Party, representing the Old and the New Unionism, exists in the Supreme Legislature, and the introduction of an Eight Hours Bill, supported by a majority of all parties in the State, may be regarded as an index of what Parliament will do in meeting the claims of Labour. Active and determined efforts are put forth to secure the return of a largely-increased number of Labour Members to Parliament, and local Labour bodies have only to organise themselves, and take in hand the responsibility of selecting the fittest and wisest persons, and their voice will be heard. The Labour Party also demands a much larger appointment of qualified working men

Digitized by Google

on the borough and county benches of magistrates; on coroners' juries in cases of fatal accident to workmen; and likewise as inspectors of mines, factories, and workshops. On its programme, municipal ownership of all works of a public character, industrial pensions in all dangerous and unhealthy occupations, and nationalisation of railways, are some of its big demands, which may be taken as indicating the trend of industrial movements in the future. All this is what has been called State Socialism, and what many regard as neither practicable nor reasonable. As to the reasonableness of State intervention in industrial affairs, the State has intervened, and will do so to a much greater extent in the future; but State interference has its limits, and how far it may undertake to organise industry in the interest of all its members will, no doubt, be a burning question for some years to come. One may dread the effect of universal State control over the means of production and distribution on individual energy; it may emasculate or brutalise the nation over which it rules. If the State should interfere till man becomes a passive creature, with no will of his own, imposing on him the military yoke, assigning his property, educating his family, holding his tenures, and ordering his daily life in strict accordance with its regulations, such a crystallised bureaucracy would annihilate his spirit and individuality, and would be the worst form of tyranny to those over whom it had the power. But there is a State interference which does not shift the responsibilities of the individual on to the State, but by means of which the State enables the individual to fulfil his own personal responsibility better. It is a kind of interference which, under a system of just laws, secures true industrial freedom, while, at the same time, it need not diminish, but strengthen, intelligent self-help and enlightened self-interest. It is certain that the power of the State will be more and more called in to remedy the enormous inequalities of modern industrial life. Some may fear lest the revolution men look for may be brought about, not by a gradual process, but by violent measures. It is

Digitized by Google

possible to conceive a revolutionary assembly of Labour delegates met at Westminster to decree that, since it is right to disestablish and disendow ecclesiastics of their unjust monopoly and privilege, the time has now arrived for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the two most monstrous monopolies —the Land and Capital, and their restoration to their rightful owner—the Nation. It is possible to conceive such an event, but not very likely. However, we may look for a more extended intervention of the State in the economic world, and a gradual extension of Government supervision, till it covers many departments of productive labour. We cannot forecast with any certainty what form the reorganisation of industry will assume, but anyone who duly weighs the urgency of the problem, and studies the many definite proposals now within the range of practical politics, may discern some of its probable lineaments. It is not likely that concentration of labour will be carried much further in manufacture, as the particular need for it has ceased. We may count on machinery being still more largely employed in production, but more widely, too, for the benefit of all thus employed. It is almost certain that the motive-power engaged in production will be no longer the monopoly of the capitalist, but at the disposal of the municipality, or other local body. Industrial evolution will be of a much more associative kind, tending towards, if not realising, the conception of a true Co-operative Commonwealth.

In conclusion, interest in the Labour Question is part of Social Christianity. It is an education in brotherhood, and bids us prefer the common interest of all, to the interests of a class. The workers do not want charity, but justice; and, knowing nine-tenths of poverty to be preventible, ask that they shall not be doomed to poverty. To them has come the glimpse of a better lot, with work and remuneration assured, and a standard of life greatly enhanced. For the distribution of wealth is not the whole question solved; secular progress is not everything. 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.' More money and fewer hours may only

Digitized by Google

mean more opportunities for vice as well as for virtue. The diffusion of wealth must be accompanied by a corresponding diffusion of active religion; secular progress must be accompanied by a new and mighty renaissance of Righteousness. Whittier points us to the panacea for our ills when he sings—

> 'Follow with reverent steps the great example
> Of Him whose holy work was "doing good";
> So shall the wide earth seem our Father's temple,
> Each loving life a psalm of gratitude.
>
> Then shall all shackles fall; the stormy clangour
> Of wild war-music o'er the earth shall cease;
> Love shall tread out the baleful fire of anger,
> And its ashes shall plant the tree of peace.'

Digitized by Google

VIII.

THE LIQUOR QUESTION.

THE Liquor Question can be stated in two sentences—how to keep the people from strong drink, and how to keep strong drink from the people. Along these two lines discussion has largely been conducted in the past, and solutions must be found in the future. Moral suasion is requisite to teach the people abstinence, while legislative control is destined to play a greater part in removing temptations to indulgence in strong drink. Whatever misunderstandings may have arisen between the advocates of moral suasion on the one hand, and the advocates of legislative control on the other, there can be no doubt that the advocacy of both methods will need to be strenuously adopted for many years with a view to lessening the evils of intemperance. The crusade against drink demands the inclusion of all remedial plans and of all parties that have the national well-being at heart. For the magnitude of the drink-sin is of a degree not easily to be exaggerated. If a being from another sphere were to visit this planet, and make it his study for a short time, nothing would astonish and confound him so much as the drinking customs of society, the great liquor traffic, and all that it involves. What would he see? Take him to a banquet or a dinner-party, and he beholds an array of crystal glasses, many-shaped and many-coloured, making such a lovely table in the eyes of every onlooker; he asks what all these cups are for, and when he sees them filled over and over again with

Digitized by Google

that which, according to the wise man, 'at the last biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder,' when he learns that the good and great enjoy these cups of pleasure, and wilfully shut their minds to the force of the wise man's saying, and shut their eyes to the facts which they encounter on every side, he would be staggered at the contemplation of a race with eyes and minds at all so hoodwinking themselves, and would pronounce them to be the victims of some monstrous nightmare. Would that pronouncement be uncharitable or unjust? Let us see.

Our inquiry calls upon us at the outset to ascertain why men drink wine and resort to strong drink, why Alcohol is king at rich men's tables and in the public-house. That it has some use medicinally, and some right to be sold in a druggist's shop, the majority of people admit; but why is it enthroned in the midst of social customs? The ready answer is that men use wine and strong drink as pleasant beverages to stimulate intensity of feeling and promote good fellowship. They desire 'more life and fuller,' they long to escape the dull monotony, and to experience the glow and warmth of life. Wine gives them pleasant excitement; strong drink vivifies the bodily and mental powers. Thoughts mount into free and rapid utterance; hues of fancy kindle into brightness; a sensation of *bien-être*, as the French say, of satisfaction with one's self and all the world, is the result. According to the Professor of the Breakfast-table, wine is the grand specific against dull dinners. Therefore men have resorted to the use of stimulants in every country and every age. Medical writers have noted several degrees of the excitement due to alcohol, and among these authorities Dr. Richardson describes four stages, but for practical purposes no more than three need to be enumerated, and each of them is marked by distinctive features. We have already touched upon the features of the first stage. At the beginning of a dinner-party the guests are reserved and decorous, social adjustment is difficult, and exchanges of intercourse are few; but as the wine begins to circulate, a general

Digitized by Google

thaw takes place, pleasant sensations are roused, ideas flow freely, 'the face begins to get flushed, the eye brightens, and the murmur of conversation becomes loud.' Such is the initial stage of excitement, in which states of thought and feeling are elevated, but still under the control of reason and the higher powers. In the second stage the same phenomena occur, but the ideas grow incoherent, and the utterance of them becomes thick and confused; the hands gesticulate, the legs are unsteady, and the whole manner betrays a want of control. The man is intoxicated. When the third stage is reached, all sensibilities are blunted, hearing and smell are affected, vision is double, and the tongue is paralysed. Reason ceases to guide and control, and the lower nature is uppermost. 'Base instincts are yielded to, the passions ride triumphant over the reason; no four-footed animal is capable of showing such degraded tendencies and such a want of decency, or committing such unnameable offences, as a man in this state of intoxication.' It is the wild-beast stage, in which a man will lift a brutal hand against comrade, wife, or child—in which he will go into a public-house a respectable man and leave it a criminal. From the bestial it passes to the dead-drunk state, when its victim will lie insensible for hours on the cold, damp street. And this is man; the crown and flower of creation; made in the image of God; for whom Christ died; who can sink lower than the beasts! And what is the agent he employs to degrade the dignity of manhood? It is that intoxicant which men, owing to the mere sway of use and wont, count a pleasant stimulus, and think necessary to the geniality of life, and associate with toast and song and occasions of joy, and everything that diversifies the scenery of existence. Instead of exalting it to this place of pre-eminence, should not every wise man accept Shakespeare's verdict on the drink question, as he puts it into the mouth of Cassio: 'O that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains, that we should with joy, revel, pleasure, and applause, transform ourselves into beasts!' The question of the time is, that if intoxicating drinks

Digitized by Google

lead to such excesses—make men 'drunk; and speak parrot; and squabble; swagger; swear; and discourse fustian with one's own shadow,' is it not incumbent on those who have virtuously kept within the first stage to relinquish it, and say with Cassio: 'O thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no name to be known by, let us call thee—devil!'

In the employment of moral suasion to keep people from strong drink, let us begin with the economical aspect of the problem, and see if it does not warrant the discontinuance of our drinking customs. Let us hear what the Economists have to say. They tell us the amount of our national drink bill, and the figures in which they sum it up, are very startling. During the last ten years our drink expenditure has averaged £136,500,000 yearly, or a million and a half more than the rental of all the houses and land in the United Kingdom. During the last fifty years the nation has, by its drinking habits, wasted upwards of 15,000 millions of pounds sterling, nearly half as much again as the total wealth of the United Kingdom. Besides this direct loss there is an indirect loss to the nation of nearly an equivalent sum on account of the destruction of property by sea and land, on account of public and private charges for crime, pauperism, destitution, sickness, and insanity, on account of the loss of wealth due to the idleness of paupers, criminals, and vagrants, due also to the non-productive employment of judges, policemen, gaolers, and other officials. These enormous amounts are annually wasted, as truly so as if they were spent in fireworks, and they would do less harm in the latter case; the expenditure on strong drink has nothing to show but a terrible catalogue of disease, crime, poverty, and premature death. In face, then, of economical aspects of the question, are we not entitled to reason with those who continue to use drink, because it is a pleasant or stimulating beverage, and to ask them if the game is worth the candle? What has been the return for this payment? Let an eminent economist, William Hoyle, be heard in reply: 'Social demoralisation has resulted, political corruption has been engendered, disease and

Digitized by Google

premature deaths have largely been caused; whilst morality, religion, education, have been obstructed and frequently blasted. If the nation, priding itself upon its high Christian character, its intelligence and great common sense, had paid this sum to be saved from these evils, it would have been praiseworthy conduct; but to buy them, and at such a price, is conduct that is so irrational as to be incredible were it not manifest before our eyes.'

If the money spent upon intoxicating drinks were properly expended, it would give employment to four millions of people; at present 500,000 are engaged in making and selling liquors—in destructive, not in productive labour, destroying as much grain as would make bread equal to about 1200 million 4 lb. loaves.

The loss of material wealth is much to be deplored, and should bring awakenment to the public mind regarding the Liquor Question, but that is not the saddest or gravest aspect of the problem. Upon grounds of national economy a crusade for keeping away people from the use of strong drink would amply be justified, but a reason of greater force than saving many thousand pounds exists for enrolling in this crusade. We go behind this drink bill of the nation to find it our national sin and national curse, which not only robs men of money, but robs them of intelligence, virtue, and religion, and brings upon them degradation, suffering, poverty, and all those social evils which so appal the heart of philanthropic statesmen and well-wishers of their country. In 1879 we learn that 310,000 were arrested for drunkenness, and over a period of ten years there was close upon two millions. It is a terrible total of arrests, and yet it does not give us any idea of the number who escaped the cognisance of the law. Of the arrests for drunkenness, statistics indicate that there are nearly as many women as men, a fact which proves that intemperance among women is enormously on the increase. There are 600,000 drunkards in this country. Sir J. Hannen, President of the Divorce Court, says that seventy-five out of every hundred divorce cases have their origin in intemperance. The

Digitized by Google

same proportion of paupers and lunatics owe their condition to the indulgence of strong drink. It supplies a vagrant population of two or three hundred thousand; it is the cause of two-thirds of the crime in our land; and it necessitates the employment of 20,000 out of 25,000 policemen required to keep the peace. All this holds up to our view a woeful picture, and yet it fails to suggest the anguish and shame, the demoralisation and misery, the disease and death, of which intoxicating liquors are the prolific cause. It is in vain to say that we exaggerate amid such facts and figures. Let us hear what great statesmen have to say about it. John Bright says: 'A monster obstacle is in our way—strong drink, by whatever name the demon is styled, in whatever way it presents itself, this, this prevents our success; remove this one obstacle, and our course will be onwards, and our labours will be blessed.' 'Drink,' said Mr. Gladstone in Parliament, 'has been the cause of a curse more terrible, because more continuous, than war, pestilence, and famine combined.' If some brooding pestilence broke out among us, no effort would be spared to escape from it, or to prevent its ravages. A blacker and more blighting curse is in the midst of us, spreading disaster, desolation, and death; and patriotism and the love of home call upon us to resist at any cost its appalling ravages. What would our country not become, if the people resolved to have done with drink? It would be so changed, and so changed for the better, that it would be almost impossible to know it again.

The testimony of medical science has an important bearing on the Drink Question, and deserves the consideration of every one who is anxious about his own health and the health of the community. Goldwin Smith writes in a pamphlet on 'Prohibitionism in Canada and the United States' to the following effect: 'Whether we or any of us ought entirely to renounce alcohol it is for science to determine. If science pronounces that we ought, there can be little doubt that the growing intelligence of humanity will gradually conform to the decision.' If, then, to medical science the question belongs,

Digitized by Google

and not to the religious or political platform, let her decide. What are the physical effects of alcohol on the bodily organs—on the brain, the nerves, the liver, the muscles? The controversy with the great mass of people is now as to the need of alcoholic liquors for purposes of nourishment and upbuilding of the body. Alcohol has long been one of our most prized national beverages, and looked upon as a necessary article of daily diet for men, women, and children. Now there are two kinds of argument which have been employed against this popular notion, and they have been advanced with more and more effect in recent years. First, there is the argument of experience. Twenty or thirty years ago, wine and brandy were freely recommended to patients without much regard to the ailments from which they suffered. Parents under medical advice allowed their children to partake of the intoxicants placed on the table. A happy change in respect of these things has been brought about by experience of their baneful results, and the change has been greatly promoted by the fact that medicine has of late years become more of a preventive than a curative science. From a love alike of humanity and of science, growing numbers of the medical profession feel that it is their duty nowadays to expose the physical risks attendant upon the habit of indulgence in alcohol. Many thousands of persons have tried both plans for themselves—that of adopting stimulants for their daily dietary, and that of banishing them altogether, and have pronounced the plan of discontinuance to be the better one. The habit of taking small doses of intoxicants morning, noon, and night, is admitted by men of cultivation and intellect, who still enjoy these beverages, to be one that may have a tendency to shorten their lives. It is well known that thousands of persons in the prisons and penitentiaries of this country, addicted to drinking, undergo a great change from the time they enter and every drop of liquor is put beyond their reach. The men regain their health and strength, and the women their former vigour and beauty. From the mortality returns of various insurance companies it is now

Digitized by Google

indisputably proved that the lives of total abstainers are twenty-six and a half per cent. better than those of moderate drinkers.

Secondly, there is the argument from physiology. The influence of alcohol on the organs of the body has within late years been submitted to the most careful tests: its action upon the muscles, the nerves, and the heart's action has been tried by experiment, and pathologists are coming more and more to the conclusion that it is of no use to any of the functions of life. Whether it can be looked upon as having any alimentary value is still a moot point among them, but they are generally agreed that it remains untransformed in the system, being discoverable in the brain thirty-six hours after its ingestion, and escapes from the body in an unaltered state. Dr. Parks, along with Count Wollowicz, has inquired into the action of alcohol, and confirmed the fact of its largely passing through the body without being changed into food. Still it has a most distinct effect upon the human organisation—a twofold effect of exciting and stupefying the system, and this is a matter of common observation. Medical men tell us that alcohol is one of the best stimulants in the pharmacopœia, and when administered in small doses—as any other poison like opium, arsenic, and laudanum may be prescribed—it has a certain value to the body under certain special circumstances, but the circumstances are such as to make out an argument against its daily and habitual use. Its use in minute quantities helps to quicken a failing heart; it acts like a spur in the side of a horse, eliciting force, though not supplying it. When it has served this end, it should be abandoned; for by its continuance, its purely stimulating effect passes into a paralysing and hurtful effect. When taken repeatedly, its prejudicial effect is well known to the physiologist. By direct contact it acts upon the stomach, and leads to a destruction of its secreting tubules. Nothing with such certainty impairs the appetite and digestive power as the continued use of strong alcoholic liquids. From the stomach it is absorbed, and with its distribution through the system it interferes with nutrition, and leads to a general tex-

Digitized by Google

tural deterioration. Upon certain organs, however, its effects are more manifest than upon others. The liver, kidneys, and nervous system, for instance, very strikingly suffer, a diseased state being set up which forms a distinctly recognisable source of death. Nothing indeed, as a rule, with greater certainty leads to premature death than alcoholic intemperance, and the managers of insurance offices are well acquainted with this fact.[1] So far as the physiological argument goes, to the uninitiated it must be a question of authorities. Let us hear, then, what the most eminent physicians of our time have to say. Sir William Gull says: 'I am persuaded that nothing better could be done than that lecturers should go about instructing the people upon the disadvantages of alcohol as it is daily used.' Dr. Carpenter, one of our greatest physiologists, says: 'In the average man, the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, in moderate or even small quantities, is not merely unnecessary for the maintenance of bodily and mental vigour, but it is unfavourable to the permanent enjoyment of health, even though it may for a time appear to contribute to it.' Dr. Richardson says: 'Finally, to sum it all up, I find that alcoholic drinks give no strength, reduce the tone of the blood-vessels, build up no muscle, destroy its powers, and make it less active for work; that these drinks in the most moderate quantity can be of no use to me or anyone else as a substance for food.' Sir Andrew Clark may wind up the testimony in the forcible words: 'Can I say to you any words stronger than these of the terrible effects of Alcohol? It is when I myself think of all this that I am disposed, as I have said elsewhere, to rush to the opposite extreme, to give up my profession, to give up everything and to go forth upon a holy crusade, preaching to all men—Beware of this enemy of the race!' When testimony, so powerful and clear and from such a quarter, sounds an alarm, surely the deliverance of humanity from this terrible evil must be at hand. A change of opinion with reference to these brain-poisoning stimulants has undoubtedly set in, and will in the near future bring emancipa-

[1] *A Treatise on Food and Dietetics,'* Dr. Pavy.

Digitized by Google

tion from their tyranny. It has already begun in the higher social circles, and the lower orders are more and more organising efforts to check the influence of all such intoxicants.

The majority of candid minds will acknowledge that Goldwin Smith's *sine qua non* for entirely renouncing alcohol has been fairly met by this testimony of science and its exponents, but whether men of culture, like this writer, will quit their Laodicean attitude on the drink question or not, must still be regarded as problematical, because there is a mass of antagonisms in the shape of sentiments and opinions, customs and habits, appetites and interests, which creates a formidable obstacle to needful reformation, and allies to itself no less the refined and comfortable than it does the rough and wretched classes of society. Notwithstanding the opinion of the writer just quoted, it is the religious aspect of the question which ought to press home the real character of the drink evil to the heart and conscience of the community, and summons every right-minded man to go up to the tribunal of his own heart and conscience and ask himself whether he should not only make a small and insignificant sacrifice in his own habits, but likewise join heart and soul in the crusade against this manifest curse of our race. For consider in what the peculiar fatality of drinking lies. It is upheld by the sway of use and wont, by the conformity of men and women to usages they have never thought seriously over, and from which it would cost them something to break free. It gains strength from appetite, which rules with a strong and blind power, and from the pleasure of company where the sparkling beverage is credited with 'the feast of reason and the flow of soul.' All this proud association adds to its fatal spell, but does not lay bare its essence, rather indeed conceals it, and so increases the risk. 'Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.' It is the way of the excitement which it causes to grow upon men, to advance without creating suspicion, to gain evil power at the very time when men are flaunting the risk of such power. Nothing is more apparent than the moral incred-

Digitized by Google

ulity with which it mocks men and hides out of view the spiritual and material effects of its indulgence. For wine takes away the heart, beguiling men till they are made special pleaders against their own conscience, as they practise one little excess after another; and in this way the craving grows to more and more. If proof were needed that alcohol is not food, it lies in this that Nature gives no food which deceives us by creating an imperceptible and insatiable desire for itself. Alcohol does this insidiously, and produces the tendency to repetition and excess. Anyone who has had to do with parties falling from moderate to immoderate habits of drink is well acquainted with the operation of this tendency. When this deceptive agent has been at work, here a little and there a little, then it lays upon the deceived its maddening and accursed spell; it is full of subtlety and mischief; it becomes the destructive scourge of humanity. Temperance reformers are often charged with the fault of exaggeration in setting forth the rage and havoc of strong drink. Let any man acquaint himself with the broad facts of this stupendous evil, or count up the narrow facts that have come under his own observation, and that among all classes, be they honourable or mean, and he will own that it is hardly possible to exaggerate. The strongest language to be found anywhere is used by Isaiah, who says regarding over-indulgence: 'Therefore hell hath enlarged her desire, and opened her mouth without measure: and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth among them, descend into it.' He means to say that the very appetite of hell would require enlargement to consume the spoils of strong drink! Does it not truly seem as if the wild and wanton waste of drink were preventible, as if it were not, as many are ready to sneer, the inevitable evil of men's hearts choosing this form of issue, but a superfluous audacity of sin, which the devil himself did not desire or tempt men to? It is this feeling of the infernal gratuitousness of most of the drink-evil—the conviction that here hell would be quiet if only she were not stirred up by the extraordinary wanton provocatives that society and the

Digitized by Google

State offer to excessive drinking—which compels temperance reformers at the present day to isolate drunkenness and make it the object of a special crusade. Isaiah's strong figure has lost none of its strength to-day. When our judges tell us from the bench that nine-tenths of pauperism and crime are caused by drink, and our physicians that if only irregular tippling were abolished half the current sickness of the land would cease, and our statesmen that the ravages of strong drink are equal to those of the historical scourges of war, famine, and pestilence combined,—surely to swallow such a glut of spoil 'the appetite of hell must have been "still" more enlarged,' 'and the mouth of hell made "yet" wider.'[1]

How, then, are the people to be kept from Drink—from its mockery, its rage, and its ruin? By persuading them to keep away from it as far as possible, and by setting them the example. Personal safety, and regard for the safety of those who are dear to us, suggest entire discontinuance of alcohol as the only safeguard against its ensnaring temptations. The medicinal use of ardent spirits may be allowed, and the apothecary could supply as much as is necessary for that purpose, but on account of the fearful abuse to which they have been turned by all classes, their usage as a personal pleasure or social stimulant ought to be abandoned and proscribed. Upon every principle of economy, patriotism, science, morality, and religion, this is the conclusion which ought to be reached. Men should have nothing to do with these liquors, except to denounce them as occasions of the most stupendous evils that curse our land, and of the most seductive snares that lead into the paths of vice. They do no good, when taken in the quantity which is ordinarily considered moderate, and if they act as a stimulant, and produce an exhilarated feeling, it is due to an improvident draught upon nature, which has to pay the penalty in a subsequent languor proportioned to the excess. Gangs of labourers have been pitted against each other, abstainers *versus* beer-drinkers, and while for a few hours the beer-drinkers have the

[1] *The Book of Isaiah*, Geo. A. Smith, M.A.

Digitized by Google

advantage, at the end of the day or the week the abstainers always prove themselves most efficient. The common and daily use of alcoholic drinks, according to the highest medical authorities, causes a very large proportion of some of the most painful and dangerous diseases which come under their notice. Strong drink gives no real good strength to body or mind, but we see it everywhere giving the strength that hardens men to beat their wives, and starve their children, and lift their arm with power to kill.

The use of wine and strong drink ought to be entirely abjured, because of their mocking and insidious tendency. Alcohol, when presented under the form of a pleasant beverage, is invested with a charm of influence, that is half the battle won in its way to the mastery over men. Appetite is allured and enticed; appetite increases with indulgence, and as it increases, satisfaction decreases. The charmer that yielded delicious dreams to-day must be doubled to-morrow, if it is to continue the delight; and so it is the fatal property of strong drink to create a mad craving for itself. As human nature is constituted, the abuse of alcohol is as certain as any of the laws of nature. In this way the ranks of the intemperate are kept up; in this way hundreds of thousands of men, some of them our acquaintances, some of them belonging to our families, are enthralled by a loathsome and detestable vice. There is only one thorough fence against this debasing evil—let men everywhere and always abstain from drink, then drunkenness and all its frightful mischiefs will cease out of the land. If every man, woman, and child adopted this simple remedy, there would be no Drink Question. When prejudice is set aside, and the practical sense of men is allowed to determine, the efficacy of this conclusion is irresistible. I know that much is said about the prudent use of strong drink, and I know that many keep within prudent use; but when the problem is how to keep the people from so huge an evil, we might as well speak of the prudent use of a widespread plague or poison. There can be, situated as we are, no prudent use of

Digitized by Google

strong drink but when it is administered as a medicine. If any vegetable proved as hurtful as these liquors, it would be banished from the table; it would not be prudent to use it at all. He is no friend of God or man who can be indifferent to this great plague of Britain, who can look on, and sit idly by, when it decimates so many of his countrymen. 'Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.' We do not echo the curse of those old words, but we do aver that half-and-half policies should be abandoned, that some clear and thoroughgoing principle of finality should change our attitude of timid aloofness to one of active antagonism against the drink curse of this country. Who does not recognise the moral simplicity and power that belongs to such a position? It is fitted to strike and tell on the habits of society as the principle and practice of moderation never can. There is a Christian self-denial in simple abstinence which has won the hearts of thousands, while it immensely strengthens the force of one's protest against the evils of intemperance. In the spirit of that chivalry and eager zeal which prompted the Holy Wars of old, let us throw ourselves into the crusade against strong drink, and never sheathe our sword till this foe of Purity and Peace has been banished out of our land.

Still further, in trying to keep people from Drink, it is wise to begin with the young.

Much is being done by a number of societies to enlighten the public upon the subject of intemperance; and as its nature, causes, and evils are made known, a healthy sentiment is created and greater willingness to discontinue drinking usages is manifest among all classes of society. Much is likewise being done in the form of rescue work among the intemperate. Not a few of the victims of drink have found deliverance through faith in the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation, and through the zealous efforts of those who, Christ-like, are seeking to save the lost. But wise reformers, and

Digitized by Google

such as have done valuable rescue work, concur in the belief that 'prevention is better than cure,' and that the young must be enlisted in the crusade against drink, if we are to have a sober and healthy people in the next generation. When men have given way to the habit of drinking, it saps the foundations alike of health and virtue, and reduces them to the condition of moral paralytics. Anyone who has tried to cure a case of this kind knows how fruitless are his efforts, and how futile are the resolutions of the victim. Such is the fearful havoc of strong drink that a very small percentage of the hundreds of thousands of drunkards in our land ever throw off the bonds of their servitude; but the children—those who are now bright and young—ought to be laid hold of, and prevented from swelling this miserable army of 600,000 drunkards in the midst of us. If we cannot rescue the intemperate from their fate, then let us keep from drink the children who are yet unhardened through the deceitfulness of this sin. It is easy to stop the evil in the beginning, though it is not easy to stop it in the end. Real safety lies in not meddling with it. And there is not a father or mother, in the ranks of the sober or inebriate, who would not rejoice to find his child becoming abstinent as a guarantee for the future. If the children are thus to be preserved, the argument is strengthened that in every family strong drink should be treated as a contraband article. Many a parent says that entire abstinence is good for the young, and that he would not lift up his finger against it, but every time he takes a glass of wine or whisky he lifts up five. 'Bands of Hope,' then, are the brightest and most promising parts of the great Temperance enterprise, and should be formed in connection with all schools, Sabbath and week-day. By such exertions the young are made acquainted with the nature and danger of this evil, and put on their guard against it; and by encouraging and extending these young battalions, such a rampart of sentiments and habits might be formed as greatly to prevent the intemperance of the rising generation.

There is as much need for keeping drink from the people as

Digitized by Google

there is for keeping people from the drink. In other words, besides the suasive power of argument against drinking customs, and their deplorable outcome, it is necessary for the public welfare to restrict commerce in ardent spirits, and secure if possible the entire prohibition of the traffic. It is not our part to wax wroth over the distillers and vendors of these articles, for they would hardly dare to pursue their calling if all the temperate in the land refused to drink. It is a legalised trade, and there are those who, to our knowledge, carry it on with respectability, and yet regret that circumstances have compelled them to abide in it. All language of impatient censure against those engaged in the traffic, so long as it is deemed a lawful calling, ought to be restrained, but at the same time the evils connected with it are so numerous and grievous as to be admitted by all parties. The tide of public opinion in relation to the drink trade is a rising tide, and the question of legislative restriction assumes every year larger and still larger dimensions in the public view. No feature of the problem is more satisfactory or hopeful than the conviction, growing in strength, that while we have a business licensed to produce so much vice and crime and misery in our midst, the evil will continue. It is like the fire which Bunyan describes as persisting to burn, though men were busy pouring water upon it. The oil poured on from behind had more effect in feeding the flame than the water had in extinguishing it. There is such a fire amongst us; it consumes our sons and daughters, our church purity, and our national honour; and when we get behind, we come upon 150,000 functionaries licensed to perpetuate it. Can this vast destructive interest be tolerated much longer? The country has begun to wake up, and grapple with this gigantic and organised traffic. It is a formidable power, watchful for every assault, resolute against every curtailment, and exerting enormous political power, which it has repeatedly, and sometimes with too much success, directed against the cause of Temperance reform. Sunday Closing Acts have been passed for Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and the Revenue returns have shown a large reduction of

Digitized by Google

spirits in consequence of these Acts; but the trade, aided by appetite and habit, has succeeded in baffling the efforts of Temperance to secure the same legislation for England. Such Acts undoubtedly produce greater quiet on that day, and help to promote its sanctity, but they hardly touch the fringe of the Drink Question. A Bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to children of tender years has been so mutilated in Committee as to be practically worthless. Temperance reformers have gone to Parliament and asked for Permissive and Local Option Bills, and for other means of limiting this terrible trade. Peers of the realm and squires have taken systematic measures to suppress the sale of liquor on their estates, and where they have done so the result has been highly beneficial. Parliament has been asked for years to allow ratepayers the very same right of suppressing the drink traffic as these landlord noblemen and squires possess, after public consideration, and by a two-thirds vote. Nothing could be more reasonable, and though it has obtained increasing majorities every year in the House of Commons, it has never got beyond the second reading till the present year. Lately a census was taken in Scotland, and about fourteen to one voted for the entire suppression of the liquor traffic; in Glasgow, more than 77,000 voted in favour of popular control, while 8500 only voted against it. The wishes of the people have thus been clearly ascertained, but have been thwarted and sacrificed to the false sentiment of 'England free rather than England sober.' It is quite open for us to consider the worth of Local Option as a thoroughgoing measure of reform. Some enthusiasm about the question has been created among the people, by the introduction into Parliament of a Liquor Veto Bill, which, if carried, will recognise for the first time local control—an end very desirable; but strong objection to it may be urged on the ground that it will fling an apple of discord into every district, or lead in the end to an extensive illicit traffic in strong drink. In 1878 the Canadian Parliament passed the Scott Act, which enables any county or city, by a majority of electors, to prohibit the sale of

Digitized by Google

intoxicating liquor, under penalty of being fined for two offences, and being imprisoned two months for the third. It remains in force for three years, and can then be repealed, if a majority so desire. Of forty-two counties and eleven cities in Ontario, twenty-eight counties and two cities adopted the Act. After a trial of it, ten counties have repealed it, and the others are lodging petitions for repeal. It has been found to make the trade an unlicensed and unregulated one, throwing it into the hands of bottle-hawkers and keepers of low dens, and instead of removing temptations from the young, multiplying cases of juvenile drunkenness. The Act is said to be a dead letter in Ontario and other provinces of Canada. A return on the working of the Liquor Laws in the Australian colonies has just been presented to Parliament. It is generally admitted that Local Option and Prohibition by direct vote, when tried, have reduced drunkenness or crime, or improved the social condition of the people; while the inspector-general of police in New South Wales reports on liquor laws that they have led families into drunkenness in their homes, and multiplied working men's clubs for the purpose of supplying members with intoxicants without any legal restriction. If Prohibition results in smuggling, secret drinking, deterioration in liquor, and a still greater deterioration in morals, this panacea only aggravates the disease, and the advocates of legislation must turn their minds to other measures. While the demand for drink remains, and a powerful interest, backed by political influence, continues, the system of Prohibition, highly to be approved so far as it can be adopted without restricting the freedom of individual action, may after trial disappoint our expectations. Any measure, with promise of success, should avoid the risks due to the substitution of an illicit traffic, and be supported by strong public feeling. The national conscience is fully alive to the gravity of the problem, and has lately pronounced a verdict on the Drink Interest, which cannot fail to limit its power and prepare the way for more thorough legislative action.

A proposal was made recently in Parliament to compensate

Digitized by Google

the publicans for the loss of their business. It may have been made with the best intentions, viz. to accomplish a sensible reduction in the superfluity of public-houses, and County Councils were to have the power of using public taxation for the purpose; but on close examination of the scheme it was found to be a cunning and dangerous device for endowing the most lucrative traffic in the land. Compensation to the publicans has been shown to be neither legal, economical, nor moral. Not legal according to the highest authorities. The law does not recognise any vested interest in a licence renewed from year to year. In 1882 Mr. Justice Field said: 'In every case in every year there is a new licence granted. You may call it a renewal, but that does not make the licence an old one. The Legislature recognises no vested right at all in any holder of a licence. It does not treat the interest as a vested one in any way.' Nothing under the present law gives a right to endow the publican with public money, in the event of his licence not being renewed. Large numbers of licences have been suppressed by landlords and magistrates, yet compensation was never dreamed of in such cases. To compensate the publicans is not economical, for it would recognise the drink traffic as a stupendous monopoly; it would give a permanent property in licences, and create a freehold worth millions to the trade. If Parliament buttressed it with a promise of compensation, its value would be enormously enhanced; and if the principle were carried out to the extent of the whole traffic, it would involve a national expenditure of £200,000,000. It would be impossible to obtain anything like a satisfactory reduction of the licences, when such immense sums had to be voted, and in this way it would raise up an insuperable obstacle to Temperance reform. Compensation is not moral. Think of compensating a class of men who make big sums of money by simply turning on the tap of a whisky barrel, who grow rich on the vice and misery of their customers. It is heavy enough to pay police and poor rates for the articles manufactured by the trade. If compensation were justly reaped, from what quarter should it be drawn? Ask the

Digitized by Google

widows and orphans who have been robbed of so much by this liquor traffic. It should be a question of Restitution rather than of Compensation.

The Bill which proposes to lessen the temptations to drink is simply an acknowledgment that something requires to be done; it is a great step in advance to find the political party in closest alliance with the liquor interests proposing to give Local Authorities power to reduce the number of licensed houses in districts where they are in excess, but it is still more satisfactory to know that by its summary rejection of the Bill, Parliament at length recognised the folly of advancing any right of compensation to publicans in the event of some larger measure being passed to reduce the number of licences. It has now been made clear that the magistrates have the power of refusing licences at the year's end, not on personal grounds only, but on public grounds—not for misconduct only, but because the houses are not wanted. The House of Lords, in the case of Sharpe *v.* Wakefield, has decided that a licence is only for a year, and must be treated like an original application. Such power has been constantly exercised without compensation, and the public conscience has awakened to the fact that a much more extensive use of power in that direction needs to be adopted. Temperance reform is acknowledged on all sides to be the greatest and most far-reaching movement since the anti-slavery cause, and to be the most urgent reform within the range of political machinery. As the obligations of government come to be more and more discharged through municipal and local bodies, who know best the conditions to be dealt with, they will exercise what some now have—powers of acquiring the control and administration of this gigantic monopoly. Since a claim to compensation has been decisively rejected by the country, the way is open for transferring to local representative bodies, not only the power of regulating the number of public-houses, but also the power of managing them in the public interest. However desirable it is to lessen the opportunities of excessive drinking, the attempt to deprive temperate

Digitized by Google

men of all power to obtain any intoxicating liquor at all will provoke a sense of wrong and a determination to resist such intolerance. Prohibition is good so far, but it wants finality. Other measures must still be adopted. In matters of public policy, we must take what we can to help forward the work of improvement, and therefore abstaining should unite with non-abstaining reformers to abate where it may not be possible at once to abolish the drink evil. Some years ago an eminent politician introduced to Parliament a Bill for the purpose of establishing in this country the Gothenburg system, which provides that no spirits shall be sold for private profits, but by salaried agents for the public good. This resolution did not obtain the support of a majority in the House of Commons, but a strong opinion in its favour was elicited. It is desirable that County and Town Councils should be empowered to acquire existing interests in the sale of intoxicating drink within their respective districts, and to carry it on likewise for the convenience of the inhabitants, so that no individual shall have any interest, nor derive any profit from such trade. It is highly expedient to eliminate private profit from the sale of drink, and put the traffic under the management of companies or corporations. Temperance legislation of this kind would remove the evils of the present portentous monopoly, and would be free from some of the defects that attach more or less to all prohibitory and coercive measures. It would avoid the spirit of lawlessness created by evasion of the law, and render needless and illicit trade, the worst of all results connected with Prohibition; it would terminate the deplorable abuses of a powerful private interest. The drink trade affords wide scope for making money—for the love of filthy lucre, and though we all know exceptions to the working of such a motive, yet it is impossible to deny that it operates too strongly and too widely in the business of a public-house. So long as this trade is a monopoly connected with private interest, true and efficient police supervision cannot be exercised over it, and it must continue to hold a disparaged position in the eyes of the

Digitized by Google

community. The whole arrangements for privacy of drinking in public-houses—so unlike what holds in any other trade—condemn it as a bad trade, and what comes out of the little 'boxes' to the streets aggravates the condemnation. In every licence it is provided that the licensee must not sell to any intoxicated person, yet to show how little that provision is regarded, take the case of Glasgow. Last year 17,000 persons were arrested in the streets as being drunk and incapable, and only nineteen publicans were charged with contravening the regulation, and only three of these were committed and punished. Magistrates and police could hardly act with greater unanimity in protecting the publicans' interest. But this does not exhaust the abuses of the drink traffic in private hands. There have grown up what are called 'tied houses,' in regard to which the magistrates decline a renewal of the licence, because the holder of it should be proprietor of the house, and should be responsible for its conduct. Such is the law in England, and according to the Home Drummond Act it is the spirit and intention of the law in Scotland. What, then, is the state of matters growing up in both countries? In Glasgow 1448 licences are held by 400 or 500 persons, and some of them have from three up to fourteen licences. It is evident that the magistrates are farming out the city to public-house monopolists, creating in fact a 'whisky trust,' under which irresponsible persons carry on the business for the benefit of others. The danger is that any prohibitory legislation whatsoever will concentrate the drink trade in the hands of the great joint-stock distillery and brewery companies; it will crush out the small man and establish the big man behind the impregnable barrier of a guaranteed monopoly. What is the remedy needed to abolish these abuses? It is a very simple one. If public-houses are to be kept open—though we would rather see them all shut—then let them cease to be a private interest; if they are becoming a 'whisky trust,' there should be only one trust, and the local governing body should be the trustee, responsible to the public which chooses it, and manag-

Digitized by Google

ing the trust for the good of the public. As the public mind advances, a determination to deal with the drink traffic on these lines may be looked for; and in the event of such a transfer of the traffic to local authorities, one of the greatest reforms will be achieved. Other improvements would follow the creation of such a public trust in the sale of strong drink. In the hands of salaried officials, having no motive to push the sale and liable to be punished for selling it to any intoxicated person, the temptations to drinking would be immensely curtailed. While it would be a lawful trade, it might be placed under stringent regulation. A high price ought to be put upon spirits, the extremest amount short of leading to illicit manufacture; such a price ought to be levied as would be compatible, not with an extended, but with the most limited consumption. For ardent spirits, which are sometimes literally poisons, lighter drinks could be substituted according to this system, and in other ways modifications could be adopted tending greatly to promote temperate habits among the people. The prospect of revenue is no doubt tempting to municipalities. What would be the effect of the system in such a direction? If they took over the drink trade, and employed their own nominees, they would derive a profit per annum twice the amount taken by taxation out of the pocket of the ratepayers. Although they carried on the business under conditions most stringently repressive, they would obtain a revenue sufficient to pay the police, to pave the streets, and promote other purposes of public convenience. We are not painting on the air, but setting forth sober truth and simple fact. In Norway and Sweden this plan of dealing with the liquor traffic has been adopted, and with satisfactory results. The Norwegian differs from the Swedish method in one particular—the application of the surplus profits, which in Sweden are used to reduce the rates, but in Norway are withheld from any rate-aided institution and given to objects of public utility which depend on voluntary contributions for support. In Norway an Act was passed in 1871 enabling societies that carried on trade and

Digitized by Google

applied the profits in aid of objects of public benefit to hold several or all the licences for the retail of ardent spirits. Societies have been formed in fifty-one out of the fifty-nine towns in Norway with a licensing authority, and the result of the change may be judged of from the fact that the total consumption of spirits fell from nearly three million gallons to a little more than a third of that quantity.

In Bergen, a large seaport town, a Committee of the Municipal Council, which is the licensing authority, invited the citizens to form a society. It was formed, and began its operations in January 1877 with a capital of about £4500. It opened fourteen places of business, and adopted every precaution to prevent any inducement to drink. The bars are placed in the most frequented and conspicuous situations, so that all the customers can be easily seen; the bar-keepers are men of respectable character, are paid fixed salaries, and have no interest in the amount sold. The bars are clean, and have no seats or snugs. After the liquor is consumed the customer leaves the premises. Nobody the worse of drink can be served, and children are not admitted. The society controls the spirit traffic only, and not the licences for wine and ale, but it has bought up a number of these licences, and set aside a part of its profits annually to secure the remainder, and thus have the entire control of the liquor traffic in its own hands.

What is the result of its labours? The consumption of spirits has been reduced to half the amount, though the population has increased by 10,000, and there has been a corresponding increase in the consumption of ale, which is of such light quality as to have scarcely more alcohol than our ginger beer. Apprehensions for drunkenness were 1186 in 1876, and only 729 in 1889 with a larger population. In thirteen years, after paying interest at five per cent., grants to objects of public utility have amounted to £64,155. The visitor to Bergen is shown a fine road out of the town to the top of a neighbouring knoll with a grand view, and it is called the Dram Way, having been made from the money so obtained.

Digitized by Google

The museum of Bergen has received about £5000; the Park Society more than that sum; the labourers' waiting-rooms that provide good and cheap food, £3070; the Society to provide Children's Playgrounds, £775. Thirty other institutions have profited in the same way, and several thousands of pounds have been given to various Abstinence Societies. Thus a certain amount of the profits is devoted to combating the evils of alcoholism, a provision worth incorporating in any future legislation. If the citizens of Norwegian towns, aided by their Municipal Councils, are able to regulate the traffic in spirituous liquors so thoroughly, and accomplish so much good, surely there is enough of energy and public-spiritedness in the citizens of this United Kingdom to rise up and do the same for themselves. Voluntary and legislative efforts to control the drink evil will likely have to proceed in this direction; at all events, in our large towns the path of reform seems to point this way; and the brilliant example set by a nation once cursed, as we still are, with the same curse, speaks to us, and says, 'Go Forward!'

Digitized by Google

IX

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY.

'BLESSED is he that considereth the poor.' The psalm, from which these words are taken, tells us of a sevenfold blessing upon the man who inquires wisely and lovingly into the necessities of the poor. In the Book of Job, the finest part of his parable—that which thrills us to the heart—is an appeal to past experience: 'When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me: because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. . . . I was a father to the poor: and the cause which I knew not I searched out.' When the betrayer urged that Mary's ointment should have been turned into money, and given to the poor, the answer of Jesus, 'the poor always ye have with you, but Me ye have not always,' seemed to be inconsiderate, and even selfish; but the want of consideration for the poor was only in appearance, for 'ye know the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich.' However bitterly the masses may speak about the caste and coldness of Christian society, of the Christ Himself they never breathe a single complaining word; for they see how all over Palestine He proved in word and deed the validity of His claim to be the Best Friend of the poor. In Him the old

Digitized by Google

prophecy was verified: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor; He hath sent Me to proclaim liberty to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.' It is this Christ-begotten passion that has moved men and women in all ages of the Church's history to consider the problem of poverty, that has constrained them to sell lands and houses to meet the needs of the poor, and that has determined them to face the problem with patient wisdom, and find out in what ways it can be thoroughly solved. In the primitive Church, when the Emperor Decius demanded the fancied treasures of the Church, a deputation requested but a day to satisfy the order; and meanwhile they assembled the lame, the blind, the diseased, friendless infancy, and helpless decrepitude, an interesting and motley group of all wretchedness, and, producing them, exclaimed: 'Behold the treasures of the Church; this is the only wealth and inheritance which Jesus Christ has bequeathed to His disciples.' In the beginning of the thirteenth century, the last of the true Middle Ages and the first of modern society, there lived a saint whose love for the poor, kindled by the love of Christ, showed itself in all the virtues of bounty, humility, and self-effacement, and made him one of the most extraordinary men of his age. In the ever-present thought of the poor, Francis of Assisi was a young man who sold all he had to help them. He offered to God all that he possessed on earth; he exchanged his clothes with a poor mendicant, and continued to wear the meanest attire. His father, a rich merchant of Assisi, did everything possible to repress his enthusiasm, and, after confining him in a dark room to no purpose, brought him before the magistrates, on a charge of giving away what did not belong to him, and with the intention of getting him to renounce his inheritance. Then came to him the supreme hour of self-conquest. Instantly stripping himself naked, and gathering his clothes and his money into a little heap before the bishop, he cried to the surrounding crowd,

Digitized by Google

'Listen and understand! Up to this moment I have called Pietro Bernardone my father—I now return to him his money and the garments I have received from him, and from this day I will only say, Our Father which art in heaven.' Love for the poor henceforth was far more to him than any individual possession. 'Are you thinking of a bride?' said a friend lightly to him. 'Yes,' he replied, 'of a bride nobler, richer, more beautiful than your fancy can conceive.' And so he looked on Poverty with benignant eyes, and chose her for his bride, whom none had chosen for his own since Christ Himself. This gentle knight of the Holy Ghost was, indeed, a remarkable instance of the Imitatio Christi, 'a sign and a wonder' to a slumbering and luxurious age. By him was founded the Franciscan Order, which repudiates all idea of property, and practises the threefold vow of chastity, poverty, and obedience, placing the second first in importance and in spiritual efficacy.

This reference is made to Francis of Assisi for two reasons, to show us, first, that there may be worse things than being poor. It is not a lot which anyone should despise. Christ not only pronounced His first benediction on the poor, but assumed poverty as His state on earth; and the mediæval layman took Christ therein for a pattern. The dignity of life, our Christian Gospel assures us, is not eclipsed, though it may be patched, or out at the elbows, and go supperless to bed. Then such an example as Francis of Assisi teaches us what heart-forces exist in the Gospel of Christ for rousing men to mitigate the condition of poverty. His method as a solution of the problem may be very defective, because it took no account of the elements that produced the problem, and overlooked essential facts and laws of life. On the occasion when the Earl of Shaftesbury passed from the House of Commons to the House of Lords, no better encomium could be pronounced than that of Sir Robert Inglis: 'The life of Lord Ashley, in and out of this House, has been consecrated, in the memorable inscription of the great Haller, "Christo in pauperibus."'

In our time, all the elements and principles of the problem

Digitized by Google

are well before us; they have been keenly discussed, and little more can be added in the way of theoretical consideration. The positive and constructive stage has been reached, and consequently palliatives and remedies of every description are now submitted to the public mind. Religious activity and emotional philanthropy are somewhat discontented at present in the face of schemes that take environment into account, or seek readjustment of economic and industrial forces. Socialistic measures that propose to alter the distribution of wealth by taking from the rich in order to give to the poor, indicate the trend of modern opinion with regard to the treatment of the question of poverty.

Clearly, then, it is the duty of the Church to recognise this state of the question, and to combine with her moral and spiritual mission a clear-sighted understanding of economic and material requirements. The element of human value is the most notable feature in recent Political Economy, and our Christian Gospel should infuse that element more and more into this region of inquiry. Consideration of the problem of poverty cannot dispense with the formal rules of the schools, but all such rules are cold and inapplicable till they are fused, fired, and set agoing by the deep convictions and passionate earnestness of the Gospel. Men of commanding genius have devised from time to time schemes of social regeneration; but they lack the true dynamic, and the only power of permanence, except when they are based upon religious faith. Christianity must supply the principle of life and the impelling force of love. It requires at once very wise heads and very warm hearts to deal with the prodigious difficulties of moral and social direction in our time.

In studying the problem of poverty, it is needful to form some just conception of its measure and extent. The most careless observer, in town or country, has only to look around him, and the spectacle of poverty and wretchedness stares him in the face; and if he is curious to know more, he has only to step aside into the city slum or agricultural hamlet, and he will come upon dark places to which one may well apply the words

Digitized by Google

of the poet—'where men sit and hear each other groan; where but to think is to be full of sorrow and leaden-eyed despair.' But individual knowledge can give no adequate idea of an evil that is national in extent, and other sources of information can be found bringing the condition of the poor in the whole land under our notice. Publicists of well-known standing have, within recent years, carried on investigations, which show the extent of the pauperism that bites into the life, and virtually saps the strength, of the nation. An exact census should give us the families, the ages, the occupations, and the wages of the poorer classes; their habits, their stoppages of work, and the entire facts of their condition. Such a plan of investigation has been adopted by Charles Booth in his volumes on the *Life and Labour of the People.* In these volumes we have an accurate survey of the London labour-world, founded on the schedules of School Board officers, and on information of each family given by official visitors of the homes of the people. This method of inquiry combines statistical exactness with a rare insight into actual individual experience. Results have been graphically tabulated, on a chromatic scale, of poverty, comfort, and wealth, and in a series of wonderful maps can be mastered at a glance. Stores of information on the state of the poor are laid up here for the use of all who wish to arouse public opinion, and awaken public sympathy for the miseries, the hopelessness, of large masses of our population. This writer informs us that out of 4,300,000 estimated population of the city of London, eighty-two per cent. belong to the manual and wage-earning classes, and he calculates that over a million and a third live below the 'Poverty Line,' or nearly one in three of the whole people. Under Classes A, B, C, D, he enumerates the strata of the poor. Class A comprises a body of loafers, casuals, and semi-criminals, numbering 33,000—from 3000 to 8000 of these sleep under arches or bridges, in sheds, up courts, or in the open air along the line of the Thames; Class B comprises the very poor, whose casual earnings are below eighteen shillings per week—over eight per cent. or 362,000 living from

Digitized by Google

hand to mouth, in a state of chronic want; Classes C and D include 609,000, earning not more than a guinea a week each family, on account of ill-paid or irregular work. There are, besides, 51,000 paupers, inmates of workhouses, asylums, and hospitals. When four to six shillings are deducted from an income of eighteen to twenty-one shillings for the cheapest tenement, the maximum expenditure is reduced to fourteen or fifteen shillings—an amount which does not leave much margin for saving. The rise of rent during the last fifty years amounts to one hundred and fifty per cent., according to Mr. Giffen's estimate. In addition to high prices for shelter, the price of most of the necessaries of life has gone up. Bread is cheaper, and there is some reduction on tea and sugar. Prices have fallen on comforts, but not on necessaries, and therefore prices have risen, not fallen for the poor. A sovereign will buy more for a rich man than it did fifty years ago, but it will buy less for a poor man. The bearing of such considerations must be kept in mind, if the measure of poverty is to be properly gauged. Nor must we forget how enormously the misery of this chronic want is increased by habits of drink and vice and bad management.

Statistics of the kind we owe to Mr. Booth have not been prepared with reference to the state of the poor in other cities and towns of the land. It has been estimated that there are at least 55,000 people in Manchester with an income below the limit of four shillings per head, after the payment of rent. In Glasgow not long ago there were 180,000 in 40,000 lodgings of one room, or nearly one-third of the whole people below the 'Poverty Line.' What exists in these three cities may fairly be taken as the measurement of poverty in all large centres of population. The condition of the poor in rural districts has not been ascertained. Hodge, stolid and silent, has been left to himself, except when now and again a man like Canon Blackley startles the world of social reformers by declaring that practically every ordinary agricultural labourer dies a pauper. There can be no doubt that a large proportion of our workers, after the

Digitized by Google

labour-power is drained out of them, are compelled to end their days in a workhouse, which they dread above everything else. There are 800,000 habitual paupers in England and Wales, and there are 138,000 tramps in Scotland, most of them such sturdy rogues and vagabonds as our ancestors whipped and hanged, but some of them are due to the short-term service in the army.

It is a deeply significant fact that one-third of our paupers are children, one-tenth lunatics, and one-half aged, infirm, or sick. Figures show that forty per cent. of paupers are over sixty-five years of age, twenty-six per cent. over seventy; one in every seven persons above the age of sixty is in receipt of parish relief; one-quarter of the total population reaching the age of sixty-five, and two-sevenths reaching seventy, are permanent paupers, obliged to seek a refuge in the workhouse, and doomed to a pauper's grave. Statisticians, reckoning that ten per cent. of the population die in workhouses, asylums, and hospitals, arrive at the conclusion that about three millions must accept public charity in some form or another throughout the whole country. Mr. Giffen's calculation is 1,800,000; Mr. Chamberlain's estimate is a population equal to that of the metropolis; General Booth fixes the number at three millions, and calls them the 'Submerged Tenth.'

Such are some of the facts and figures of poverty; dry and uninteresting as statistics, but, when we go behind them, vivid and replete with silent tragedies of want and woe, of human life as an increasing struggle for existence, and of outlook uncheered by a ray of hope.

Next to the facts, we should closely examine the causes of poverty, for by doing so we come nearer to putting our finger on the heart of the problem.

Inquiry into causes is the application of reason to observed facts. Facts by themselves are silent until they are interpreted by reason. Nothing is so untrue as statistics when they are manipulated to serve a purpose. The human mind is ingenious in devices for discovering resemblances between events and

Digitized by Google

relations, between cause and effect. Sometimes facts explain themselves, and give direct answers to the plainest intelligence, but where the connection of events is not superficial only, but well under the surface, different explanations will be given, and the facts must be submitted again and again to the trained reason, in the course of which it may be found that the facts, when rearranged, support an opposite conclusion, and that what was at first treated as a cause is largely or entirely an effect.

Now in the consideration of poverty it is important to determine how far poverty is due to certain evils, or how far these evils are due to poverty. Two distinct mental attitudes on this part of the subject are pointed out by investigators who, like Mr. Charles Booth, bring true feeling as well as trained reason to a proper realisation of the facts. On the one hand, there is the ordinary position of a first-glance observer, who finds the moral factors of vice, folly, and extravagance to be palpable causes of poverty. This common view is expressed by Mr. Arnold White in the words: 'It is a fact apparent to every thoughtful man that the larger portion of the misery that constitutes our Social Question arises from idleness, gluttony, drink, waste, indulgence, profligacy, betting, and dissipation.' Such is the ordinary position taken up by the Individualist of the economic world, and acquiesced in by many clergymen and philanthropists who try to improve the condition of the poor. Another position, however, is advanced that vice, folly, and extravagance are in a large measure the result and not the real origin of poverty; are due to the monotony—the hopelessness—of the hard and grinding lot of the poor.

Here, then, are two sides in the problem of causes. Which of them is true, or has most of the truth? Is it necessary to take one side or the other? Or is it possible so to sift and analyse the facts, and balance them one against another, that we can perceive where it is a cause that is at work, or an effect? That drink and vice and improvidence have much to do—a vast deal to do—with the increase of poverty, nobody will dispute. It is a factor—each of these—patent to anyone with an eye in

Digitized by Google

his head. We see people once well off ambling about our streets in rags and misery. The accursed drink has done it all. We know what thrift and wise management can do to make a happy home on a very low wage, and we know how from thirty shillings to £3 a week may come into a house, and yet it shall not be a home in any true sense, but a wasteful and squalid pigsty.

Nothing is gained by trying to minimise the abuses of drink and waste that are at the root of so much destitution and misery. At the same time, such causes may not account for all the facts and figures of poverty, and some causes may have escaped notice, and it may be discovered on closer examination that intemperate and improvident habits, though fruitful sources of evil *now*, are part of that baneful heritage which Scripture refers to as 'the desolations of many generations.' Let us see.

A new sifting of facts discloses the presence of poverty without any moral fault to explain it. Mr. Charles Booth gives us the result of a careful analysis of 4000 cases of 'very poor,' and groups them according to the apparent causes of distress. Four per cent. are set down as 'loafers,' fourteen are attributed to drink and thriftlessness, twenty-seven are due to illness or family misfortune, and fifty-five are assigned to 'questions of employment'—these questions being low wages or uncertain work. Judging by this analysis, we find only eighteen per cent. of poverty due to drink and other moral evils, while sixty-eight per cent. of the very poor were in that condition because of the fluctuations of trade and the evils of irregular and ill-paid labour. If this state of things exists to a wide extent, the problem of poverty is due to economic mal-arrangements, and its principal source must be sought in the chaos of competitive anarchy. We have it for a phenomenon of the time that certain classes of the people are overworked, and other classes can get no work; that in many departments of labour men at times had to work ninety or more hours a week, while their comrades had to be idle; that railwaymen and others run twenty to forty-five hours at a stretch to the

Digitized by Google

detriment of their health; that young children are compelled to work as half-timers when they should be at school; and that married women toil in factories, instead of keeping house at home, because the husband could not earn enough to provide his family with barest necessities. These, and such-like anomalies, if they do not create, help to swell, the ranks of the unemployed—that 'reserve army' of modern industry, without which, according to Charles Booth, the present capitalistic system could not be carried on. Irregular and uncertain employment is, in some respects, a greater evil than low wages that come in every week, for it induces people to live on the minimum wage, and to spend the rest on drink. Precarious occupation tends to undermine thrift and self-reliance, and to breed a fatalism that is blind and reckless. Without any sense of security, and subject to great privations, men pass an existence which can only be described as from hand to mouth, and which not unfrequently ends in pauperism and crime.

Men who know, like Charles Booth and the Rev. Samuel Barnett, a well-known clergyman in the East End of London, do not find the origin of poverty in the vices of the poor. However concrete and flagrant such vices may be in individual cases far too numerous everywhere, they do not go to the root of the problem, or account for its severity. If the people ceased to drink, and became thrifty and industrious, the evils of the problem would be vastly mitigated, but not ended. The deplorable truth is that honesty, sobriety, and willingness to work do not suffice to save thousands of worthy people from the harsh clutches of permanent pauperism, and that, owing to the glut of the modern labour-market, temperate and thrifty labourers are constantly in danger of sinking into the abyss.

While we are free to condemn vices of drink, dirt, and do-nothing, and free to let the weight of our just censure fall on particular cases, let us divest our minds of the prejudice—the judgment formed prior to investigation—that the existence of hopeless, helpless misery in the land is explained by intemperance and wilful idleness. 'It is their own fault' is a taunt

Digitized by Google

which should not be on any of our tongues. Does it not make one's blood boil at times to hear capitalists, and even ministers of the Gospel, blaming the improvidence and incompetency of the residuum for all the distress of the situation? Surely it comes with an ill grace from men and women who, it may be, never earned a penny all their days, and would be equally incompetent if they were sucked into the vortex of the struggle for existence. Let us accurately gauge every cause, not allowing one to escape, giving to each its proper weight; and let us realise more than heretofore that the poverty of the poor is largely the result of the competition of the very poor.

At this stage of our inquiry several questions naturally arise, and space forbids us to do more than allude to them. It will be asked, 'Is poverty increasing or decreasing?' Doubtless, in the main body of the working classes, the last fifty years have witnessed decisive improvement in the standard of comfort. They have obtained higher wages and shorter hours of work. Poverty, misery, and toil are not more general and severe now than at any former period; relatively to the increase of the population, less general and severe; but the people grow more sensitive as they advance in education, and discontent is sharpened by the stress of poverty. Although great improvement is marked in the upper grades of skilled labour, the lower grades of unskilled and unorganised labour experience a depth of poverty and misery without a parallel in the history of the world.

Another question is, 'Can poverty be altogether extinguished?' If the absolute number of the very poor, through an increase of population, is greater now than ever it was, it seems as if the disease were too deeply rooted in human nature to be eradicated. In spite of all the good work done, poverty is still with us, and Christ's words are still true, 'The poor ye have always with you'; but He did not say that the poor were always to be with us, and they are His legacy to us only that we may relieve their wants, and work such changes in their condition that they shall cease to be poor. The poverty of the

Digitized by Google

poor ought to be diminished, nay, ought to be abolished, and it would be if we probed the causes to the bottom, and resolutely dealt with them, instead of everlastingly tinkering with the results of these causes. We must not for ever be baling out the ship, but must stop the leak, in order to the prosperous voyaging of humanity.

That poverty remains with us a stubborn and inveterate evil, the history of remedial efforts does not fail to illustrate. Attempts have been made by civilised communities in all ages to drain this Slough of Despond, in which disappear so many dreams of the universal prevalence of happiness. As a matter of State policy, some provision for the poor has always been adopted. Societies for the relief of distress, created chiefly by war, arose in the democratic states of Greece; and among the Romans, Agrarian laws were passed to prevent the extremes of wealth and poverty. The distribution of grain at reduced prices, and then gratuitously, continued for a long period. Augustus tried in vain to suppress it. In his time, 200,000 citizens were thus fed. It turned Rome into a city of mendicants, and hastened the downfall of the empire. The burden of care for the poor was transferred to the Christian Church, and in softening the rigours of their lot its finest successes were won. In the Middle Ages, feudalism held the toilers in a state of serfdom, and charged itself with attending to their wants; while the monasteries and abbeys, gradually absorbing the wealth of Christian countries, became the great receivers and dispensers of alms. With the break-up of the mediæval Church at the time of the Reformation, the revenues of the abbeys were plundered by the nobles, the doles at the monastery gates ceased, and multitudes of mendicants, bred by this promiscuous charity, were let loose over the land. Severe measures of restraint, adopted earlier than the Reformation, were put in force. Indiscriminate almsgiving was forbidden, and the sturdy beggar treated without mercy. For the first offence he was whipped, or branded with a V on the shoulder; next, he had his ear cropped, and could be claimed by anyone, fed on

Digitized by Google

bread and water, and forced to work by beating; and on a third conviction he was sentenced to death, as a felon and enemy to the commonwealth. A distinction was, however, made between sick and impotent persons unable to earn a livelihood, and strong and masterful beggars who could, but would not, work. For the maintenance of the former class, charitable ways and means of different kinds were adopted. At length the transference of this duty from the Church and voluntary aid to the State took place in 1563, when the Act of 5th Elizabeth provided for an assessment by justices; and in 1601 the celebrated Act of 43rd Elizabeth, taxing all property for relief of the poor, laid the basis of the Poor-Law system of England up to the present time.

An Act of the same kind was passed in the Scottish Parliament of 1579, introducing compulsory assessment to supplement church-door collections, and requiring a register to be kept by justices and magistrates of all aged, poor, and impotent persons within the parish, and ordering a 'testimonial' to be given to parties not belonging to the parish for permission to beg their way back to their own parishes. All the main features of the existing law are outlined in this Act. So strong, however, was the opposition to compulsory assessment that this part of the Statute did not come into practice till about the year 1755, or even much more recent times. In 1820, out of 885 parishes, only 192 were assessed; all of them, except a very few, are now under assessment.

Although kirk-sessions managed, out of the church-door collections and private appeals, to meet deserving cases, the land continued to be overrun by hordes of vagabond poor, who lived by levying contributions and free quarters; and, even so late as the end of the seventeenth century, Fletcher of Saltoun describes the extent of the evil: 'There are at this day in Scotland 200,000 begging from door to door. These are not only no ways advantageous, but a very grievous burden to so poor a country; and though the number of them be double to what it was formerly, by reason of the present great distress, yet in all times there

Digitized by Google

have been about 100,000 of these vagabonds, who have lived without any regard or submission either to the laws of the land or even of those of God and nature.'

The care of the poor was practically left in the hands of the Church for two centuries and a half, and that parish poor-box—the church plate—served to maintain a system permeated with the spirit of Christian benevolence, and so economically administered, so discriminating in its distribution of relief, and so careful of that spirit of independence which distinguished the peasantry and poorer classes in Scotland, that men—like the great-souled Dr. Chalmers—felt it to be a misfortune when the Church was dissevered from the great work of poor relief. But the growth of population, the growth of the Industrial Revolution, and the growth of Nonconformity, were conditions which rendered the system of voluntary assessment every Sunday utterly inadequate. Commissions of inquiry into the operations of the Poor Laws were appointed, and it was found that outdoor relief to the able-bodied had virtually turned the Poor Laws into a method of paying wages; that the effect of such relief on the wages of labour was to keep them hopelessly low, and on the labourers, to produce a state of things in which the self-reliance and industry and integrity of the lower classes had almost become extinct. Following those commissions of inquiry, the English Act was passed in 1836, the Scotch Act in 1845, and the Irish Act in 1847. These Acts laid down rules for greater stringency in the administration of the Poor Law, and secured adequate funds for the relief of destitution. Fifty years' trial of the new law has confirmed the opinions of trained observers as to its operations. Adam Smith wrote more than a century ago: 'To remove a man who has committed no misdemeanour, from the parish where he chooses to reside, is an evident violation of natural liberty and justice. The common people of England have now for more than a century together suffered themselves to be exposed to this oppression without a remedy.' At the beginning of this century, Malthus declared the system of the Poor Laws to be an

Digitized by Google

evil, 'in comparison of which, the national debt, with all its magnitude of terror, is of little moment'; and at the end of it, John Morley tells us that the most bitterly-resented grievances of the dim, inarticulate multitude is the treatment which they receive under this much-vaunted system of Poor-Law relief. From 1600 to 1890, the sum spent in this way is estimated at £734,000,000, yet those who administer the law are painfully conscious that it is the most serious impediment to thrift and good citizenship at present at work in the English social organism. Since an evil Poor Law must be nothing short of a national calamity, it is evident that the work of its reform should be pushed forward until its evil is abolished.

There are several directions in which Poor-Law Reform ought to be prosecuted.

First, something should be done with the able-bodied poor. The Scotch law differs from the English and Irish in giving no relief to able-bodied adults. But it is a fault that they are allowed to roam at large through the country. If they are 'well and stark in body and able to work,' they should be compelled to work. From 1594 to 1698, various Acts were passed in the Scottish Parliament directing the establishment of correction houses for idle and vagabond beggars; and if these had been established and carried out on industrial lines, a most difficult phase of the Poverty Question might have disappeared. There are two classes of poor who should be provided for, respectively—those who will not work, and those who will, but have not the opportunity. For those who will not work, but live by tramping and 'sorning' on the public, that course should be followed which other countries are following. According to German law, begging is strictly prohibited, and the magistrate must punish everyone found doing so, and after a third offence send him for six months or two years to an *Arbeithaus*, where he is forced to work. Indiscriminate almsgiving, with all its attendant evils both to giver and receiver, has thus been stopped. Cases of vagrancy and incorrigible laziness should be sternly dealt with, and able-

Digitized by Google

bodied tramps should be made to work, even though they might have, as an inspector of poor once said, to be chained to it. Bishop Ken, in his poem of *Edmund*, wrote two centuries ago of an ideal king—

> 'No sturdy beggars in his lands could lurk,
> But were in proper houses forced to work.'

Bishop Berkeley, to whom the distress of the poor was a wailing spectacle, tried to help them; and in his *Querist* asks whether temporary servitude would not be the best cure for idleness and beggary—a state wherein one should be well worked, fed, and clothed. He asks: 'Whether the most indolent would be fond of idleness if they regarded it as a sure road to hard labour.' A firm, strong hand should be laid on the 138,000 tramps and professional beggars in the country. They outnumber the available force of soldiers for Great Britain, and should become, by drafting, an army of honest toilers. When they have been convicted of begging so many times, the authorities should say to them that if they are unwilling to work they must be made to work, and sent off to a labour-colony or real workhouse.

As to the able-bodied poor desirous of obtaining work, they should be carefully distinguished from the idle and vicious class, and labour should be given to them in separate places or houses, where they can earn the cost of their food and lodging if they are travelling in search of employment, or where they can remain for a time at a wage not to compete with the open market, and continue until they acquire steady habits of industry, and can take their place as honest and useful members of society. Ruskin says: 'There should be established, entirely under Government regulation, manufactories and workshops for the production and sale of every necessary of life, and for the exercise of every useful art . . . that any man, woman, boy, or girl out of employment, should be at once received at the nearest Government school, and set to such work as it appeared, on trial, they were fit for, at a fixed rate of wages determinable

Digitized by Google

every year.' Here, again, Germany has led the way of reform in those twenty-two labour-colonies, initiated by Pastor Von Bodelschwingh of Bielefeld, and providing to all who are desirous of work, food, shelter, and remuneration low enough to induce a man to search for employment in the ordinary way. These institutions help to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving, separate between the sheep and the goats, enable the honest to obtain work, and, often what is far better, to regain the ranks of industrious citizens; while, along with the strict laws against begging, they have reduced the evil to such an extent that the veteran tramps have had to cross the frontiers into Roman Catholic countries for an opportunity of practising their deception on the ignorance and soft-heartedness of society. Of course, it will be objected against such workshops, national, municipal, or otherwise, that they would interfere with trade; and no doubt care would need to be taken that the products of such labour were not used to undersell the ordinary producers, as the matmakers often complain, and with some reason, of being undersold by the products of convict prisons.

The institution, as an experiment, of a certain number of farms, villages, or workshops, to provide work at fair wages, ought to be encouraged, in order that, if successful, it might be expanded and made permanent. Such experiments have been made by the Rev. C. W. Stubbs, Vicar of Stokenham, with glebe land, by the workhouse authorities at Newcastle-on-Tyne, and by the pauper colonies in Holland. A good example is furnished by Mr. Mearns, who says: 'We tried an experiment with 100 men to work for one shilling a day—to give all their time, and to work as hard as they could till they had learnt the work, after that to be paid by the piece. The 100 men were sent to Lincolnshire. Two months afterwards fifty-nine of them were still at work in the peat field—twelve had turned out very badly—some had found better situations. Some were earning fifteen shillings, one as much as twenty-five shillings. After three months' test a number were helped to

Digitized by Google

emigrate to Canada, and one of them is at present earning twelve shillings a day in Canada. When these men were applied for to work for one shilling a day, 307 presented themselves in the hall and a number outside were unable to get in. Three men who were not selected walked from King's Cross to Doncaster, and thence to the peat works at Medge Hall and asked to be taken in.'

Discrimination of classes, with a different treatment for each class, is of the utmost importance in order to dispauperise the poor. At present, the promiscuous herding of all sorts—moral and physical wrecks of every description with little children—is contaminating, and feeds the evil that the Poor-Law system is meant to cure. *The Poor Law as it exists, is a demoralising institution.* If any reform is practicable, there must be a proper classification of the poor, and each class must have wise and Christian remedies applied to it. The workhouse should be, in name and in reality, an establishment for those who are able to work, and should have separate buildings, under different regulations, that shall keep clear the distinction between those who are willing, and those who are unwilling, to work. In the Poor House, strictly so called, there should be an equally careful discrimination of inmates by classes so as to preserve the less fortunate from the contaminating influences of our collective charity which necessarily bears a stigma of disgrace. To begin with, there are the children. The State holds the place of parent to upwards of 50,000 children, and, in the event of the tramps being compelled to work, their children would require to be legislated for. It is quite evident that the children ought never to be herded together in large numbers, and least of all in pauper barracks. Anyone who has looked into the pale faces of workhouse children, and taken note of their furtive looks and resourceless ways, must be convinced that such confinement and discipline do not fit them to face the battle of life. There is truth in the observation that the training got in a bad home is better than that obtained in a good institution. Some more humanising and self-reliant nurture ought to be

Digitized by Google

provided for the 'little ones,' like what they get in Barnardo and Quarrier Homes. They should be boarded out, or gathered into houses under a man and wife of Christian character, with not more than twenty in each building.

At the other extreme of life, a sad sight meets our eye in every workhouse—the presence of poor old people associated with paupers of all descriptions, such as imbeciles, vagrants, and dissolute women. The fact of living to old age is a guarantee that on the whole they have spent a sober, hard-working life, but they have been cast off by heartless children or have outlived their natural helpers, and nothing remains for them but the paupers' Refuge. What a sum of misery is depicted in the face of that old man or that old woman, who sits in the workhouse hard by some foul-mouthed inmate, and looks blankly at nothing for hours together! The old couple were not born paupers. They, too, had their entry into life with bright dreams of future happiness, and thoughts of a home full of smiling faces and helping hands. But soon came the struggles of the competitive world to make life a grinding toil, and soon the children, one by one, were lost to life or virtue or use, and, then, crushed and unhelped, the two have tottered into the workhouse to meet there the last indignity which life can offer—that of sundering what God hath joined together, that of parting them from one another. The nightmare of the industrious poor is the shame and the fear of a pauper's old age and a pauper's grave. Old people who have been respectable ought to be more kindly treated. When married, they should be together. They should have what comfort and liberty may relieve old age. The old man should have his bit of tobacco, and the old woman should have her teapot and boiling water to make her own cup. They should be allowed out when they wish to go out and see their friends, and the petty indignities of workhouse dress should be done away. There should be no brass buttons to the men's coats, however long they may last, and no tiny check shawls for the women, but such material for dresses as ordinary mortals wear.

Digitized by Google

In view of this inhumanity to the aged poor, no wonder that social reformers and statesmen have turned their thoughts to larger measures of provision for old age; and much is said and written about plans that shall make it easy for the working classes to provide against destitution in their declining years. If some plan of pension or insurance could be carried out on a scale of sufficient magnitude, there can be no doubt it would do more than anything yet tried to save the industrious poor in old age from the painful and degrading necessity of being thrown on the parish. The question of superannuation is one of enormous difficulty, and will certainly occupy sagacious minds for some years to come. Doubts may be felt as to particular schemes, and fears entertained lest the providence shown by the working classes in their established friendly societies should be interfered with. If voluntary, they would have to contend against the indifference of the industrial classes to a contingency so remote as an annuity at the age of sixty. The Post-Office Savings Bank will, for sixpence a week, ensure a man, at the age of twenty-three, £70 for old age, and yet it is not taken advantage of to any extent. Friendly Societies acknowledge that superannuation is a dead letter among them, so that voluntary schemes do not seem able to cope with the difficulty. If compulsory and general, they will tax the poorest of the poor for the support of others who are less poor than themselves. State Socialism of this kind may undermine the dignity and independence of the working classes. Although a case may be made out for something of the kind, the whole question will have to be thought out with patience. A system of State Insurance for the aged has been adopted in Germany, and will be watched in this country with interest for the next few years. At any rate, let it be noted that the working man who says that he cannot spare sixpence a week for a pension, but yet spends half a crown a week on drink, will be a pauper in the end; while the working man who is willing to pay the sixpence a week may secure to himself an annuity of £20 a year after sixty years of age.

Digitized by Google

The difficulty in the way of all such schemes arises out of depths of industrial want which they do not sufficiently measure. When an artisan earns £2 or thirty shillings a week he knows how to invest his savings, but what is to be done with agricultural labourers with fourteen shillings a week, and with the proletarian multitude who depend on insecure earnings or bare-subsistence wages? The question with them is a day-to-day struggle for existence, and not a method by which they may procure an annuity in old age. The worst forms of poverty are to be found in the lowlands of labour, among those who are poorly paid and have irregular employment, and seem to stick fast in the slough of destitution. We find the crux of the problem in this class of persons, who cannot help or improve themselves, and who are powerless except to drag down others and multiply children as ineffective as themselves. It is no deliverance to say, with advocates of the Survival of the Fittest, that these failures must go to the wall, or be left to stagger blindly under dull burdens, and at last be shovelled silently back under the ground. Such acquiescence in their blank outlook would be as suicidal as it is heartless: for, as Charles Booth says, 'some day the individualistic community, on which we build our faith, will be obliged for its own sake to take charge of the lives of those who, from whatever cause, are incapable of independent existence up to the required standard.' He thinks that the time has come for us to take voluntarily on our shoulders the burden we have to carry involuntarily round our necks, and proposes a 'Drainage Scheme' to remove the 'very poor,' and place them in industrial communities, under proper Government supervision. 'Put practically, my idea is that these people should be allowed to live as families in industrial groups, planted wherever land and building materials were cheap; being well-housed and well-warmed, and taught, trained, and employed from morning to night on work, indoors or out, for themselves, or on Government account.' His namesake, General Booth, acting on these lines, proposes a 'Way Out,' in his scheme of the City Colony, the Farm Colony, and

Digitized by Google

the Colony Over-sea. It is grand, in days of Eiffel Towers, Forth Bridges, and Mont Cenis Tunnels, to find philanthropists who can move the national heart to 'efforts commensurate with those we daily apply to the removal of material obstacles—to seek to drain lakes of misery, to bridge chasms between the rich and the poor, to tunnel the hard rock of hereditary evil habits.' God speed such generous enterprises, and multiply them; but do they alter the surroundings or stay the conditions which produce this miserable class? They do not arrest the maleficent action of the competitive system and the uncertainties of employment. Unless the cause be rooted out or enormously controlled, its effects will surely be repeated. Drain the residuum beyond our fondest hopes, it will fill again. While we allow the cause of an evil to exist, and deal with results, we merely lift one man out of the Slough to see another pushed into it. The problem, in order to be solved, demands a readjustment of economic and industrial conditions. There are a hundred ways of attacking this misery. A change in the Land Laws will take us to the root of the matter, and an organisation of labour, extended to the lowest class, will vastly better their lot. The sooner we stop the drain of population from country to town the better for the working people and for the nation. We exploit the country for the good of our towns; we emasculate our towns and feed our social perplexities; we drain both country and town to send our picked men over the seas. And so it may be we are following 'the giant forms of empire on their way to ruin.'

There is no one panacea to undo the heritage of poverty, vice, and wretchedness in our land—not one except it be the Gospel of the Son of Man, who came 'to seek and save that which is lost.' It contains the healing balm to bind up the wounds of our humanity. If it has healed our hearts, it will make us not only 'consider' the poor, but seek them out that we may do them good; it will press home the claim upon us for individual toil, and constrain us to seek out objects and methods of helping them. Spontaneous and independent action, quite unknown to

Digitized by Google

others, may do much good. Have we the spirit and the skill to go to the waste places of humanity and colonise for Christ? But churches should really love and care for the poor, and should organise bands of visitors to put themselves in touch with the homes of the people. If they organised a number of wise and loving hearts, and sent them into needy districts of the parish for the purpose of establishing close personal relations with a small number of families, that would be an arrangement capable of being developed and utilised almost to any extent. Such visitors could do many things for a few people, and not one thing for many people, which is the present imperfect method of Church work among the poor. After establishing close acquaintance, and exerting kindly Christian influence, they might lift many a family out of improvidence and want. Each band of visitors, sent forth by the churches and working in an allotted district, might grow into a Neighbourhood Guild, uniting the inhabitants of a given locality to raise the physical and moral standard of its houses and streets. It is the duty of churches, and of their ministers, to bring the best of their members into near touch with the poor in their homes. No doubt, it is hard, self-denying, often disappointing, but truly Christ-like service. 'Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble. The Lord will preserve him, and keep him alive; he shall be blessed upon the earth: and thou wilt not deliver him unto the will of his enemies. The Lord will strengthen him on the bed of languishing: thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness.'

Digitized by Google

X.

HOUSING OF THE POOR.

In the advocacy of social reforms, public attention is strongly turned to a great scientific doctrine of the day—the action of Environment upon the organism. All men of science recognise it to be an important factor in the growth and development of life, and by some teachers it is regarded, along with heredity, as the master-influence of the organic world. Herbert Spencer sums up the scientific doctrine when he says: 'Whatever amount of power an organism expends in any shape is the correlate and equivalent of a power that was taken into it from without.' The power of climate and other external surroundings largely to modify lower organisms is acknowledged by every naturalist, and yet certain elements in the organism itself make Environment alone an inadequate explanation of life. When we come to the study of man, however powerful may be the play of innate, personal forces, we find manifold influences acting upon him from the outside. No man selects his own parents or the country in which he was born. We are all very much the creatures of our surroundings and of the education we receive from infancy to manhood. Dryden, the poet, states this point with sufficient edge—

> 'By education we are most misled,
> We so believe, because we so were bred:
> The priest continues what the nurse began;
> And thus the child imposes on the man.'

Digitized by Google

The present age is moved with aspirations for the welfare of the people, and in the new ideals held up for its pursuit the influence of external and social arrangements has been awarded a paramount place. Healthy surroundings are spoken of as if they were a veritable gospel, all that we need for the perfecting of individual citizens and for the inaugurating of a virtuous commonwealth. Undoubtedly, among many of the Socialist school there is too much inclination to think that Environment is everything, and to ignore the reaction of the organism on the environment. You may take a family out of a hovel and put it into a roomy, well-lighted, and decently-furnished dwelling with a garden round about it; but if the members of that family are vicious, dirty, and undisciplined, the better house will soon be back to the condition of the hovel. There are types of men and women, results of the Industrial Period, who cannot be suddenly changed even if their environment be suddenly transformed. It is contended, and with entire truth, by friends of religion and the Gospel, that a change in the human organism alone goes to the root of the problem. Christ's cure is, 'Ye must be born again.' If this panacea be overlooked or despised, no great deliverance from our social ills is likely to be wrought by any other measures. Man is a moral agent, and must always be so viewed in order to have a proper recognition at once of the rights of nature and spirit. The method of Jesus differs from that of all other reformers, who start from some outer circle; He began at the centre. Human attempts at reform generally attack first the externals of life. 'Give them healthy surroundings: give them good houses: give them material help of various kinds, and all will be right.' Such advice ignores the most stubborn elements of difficulty in the problem—the perversity and self-will of human nature. If men are to be reformed, the inner nature, the heart, conscience, intelligence, and will of the individual needs to be quickened and renovated. New heart-forces in the Gospel of Christ, when yielded to, produce a change of character that soon makes for itself an appropriate environment. The true remedy for the disorders

Digitized by Google

of our time lies in a rectification of man's relations to God—in the regeneration which proves Christ to be a real Saviour and the power of a new life. 'Christ crucified, the power of God and the wisdom of God,' has started a new career for humanity, and this He does by fastening on the divineness in man and by sloughing off his depravity. The note which Christ strikes is on the higher, finer, diviner side of human nature, and as soon as it is struck there comes back the rich vibration of the ancient psalm: 'Thou hast made man a little lower than the angels.' Thousands upon thousands of men and women, many of them among the poorest and vilest and most downtrodden, have thus been brought to Christ, and the saving change has wrought all round the periphery of life—'inward evermore to outward.' It has raised them in the social scale, and set them in congenial and improved surroundings, while the alteration of mere outward conditions has been futile to change the principle or conduct of life in a virtuous direction. When attempts are made or proposed on every side to adjust social grievances by methods exclusively material, there is need of the reminder that all social problems are spiritual at heart, and are only capable of radical solution by means of spiritual forces acting within. We must start from the centre.

On the other hand, the fact must not be overlooked that environment does modify the organisms, as all science teaches, and does exert a powerful modifying influence as a condition of human life. Such influence may not be so radical as that which the Gospel wields, but it is powerful enough to need being taken into serious account. Lay as much stress as we like on the vital truth of change of character, we ought not to ignore the immense force of environment to strengthen and perpetuate hereditary tendencies. We do not expect a high type of life to be bred in a back slum, trained amid filth and ugliness, and accustomed to the sights and sounds of profligacy and profanity. None of us, who are situated in favourable surroundings, would like to be ourselves, or to have our offspring, placed in such unhealthy and indecent conditions of life. If a score of chil-

Digitized by Google

dren, taken from the commodious houses of the middle class, were planted from infancy in the wretched dwellings of the poor; if they heard oaths from their childhood, and witnessed scenes of vice and crime on to mature years, can there be any doubt that most of them would turn out drunken, dissolute, and worthless, however sober and respectable their parents may have been? But if the process were reversed, so that a like number of infants belonging to the poor could be taken into households healthily situated, and could be surrounded by purity and kindness, is it not certain that bad tendencies would be checked, and that most of them would grow up into a sober, righteous, and godly life?

Now, in all our large towns there are districts full of dwellings closely packed together without regard to health, or comfort, or decency; many of them squalid rookeries that contribute largely to the physical and moral degradation of our labouring people; hotbeds of disease, in which strong men succumb, healthy women sicken, and feeble children die. Those who labour among the poor find the insanitary and dismal conditions of their lot to be the gravest obstacle in rendering any efficient and permanent help. The very thought of those terrible dwellings—it would be ironical to speak of them as 'homes!'—would excite surprise if we found in them any domestic life at all. To be indifferent to the manifold evils connected with such a state of things, and above all to excuse ourselves from taking any practical interest in correcting it, *because the spiritual method is the only cure*,—that, surely, is nothing less than a part of 'the inhumanity of man to man.' Internal and external reforms must alike proceed together. We must strive to unite the fundamental elements, on which the moral life of man must always rest, but which have somehow fallen asunder in our present divided life. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the origin of the problem. Little good is served by anxiety to find out how overcrowding and unhealthy surroundings have been caused, and on whom the blame of this condition of things should be laid. It has

Digitized by Google

been a concomitant of vast changes in the social and industrial world during the last century. In that time an unexpected increase of the population has taken place, and what is termed the Industrial Revolution has swept the people out of country districts into large cities, provincial towns, and new centres of trade. A rapid growth of towns has taken place, along with a corresponding diminution of rural communities. In 1801, when England and Wales had a population of 9 millions, it is estimated that only a third lived in towns; but now, with a population of 28 millions, more than two-thirds are gathered into the towns. This rapid growth of population and exodus of country people into the towns began ere long to show itself in a congestion of populous districts, in the erection of defective dwellings, and in a general violation of the laws of health. The people were huddled together in the neighbourhood of the factory, the coal mine, or the shipbuilding yard. In the hurry to make fortunes little regard was given to the kind of habitations erected for the workers; neither masters nor municipalities thought much about the matter; the landowner found an El Dorado for himself by feuing small pieces of ground that had no value but what the arrival of the people gave it; and so there were none to devote time or attention to the improvement of the dwellings of the people. Unsightly rows of brick buildings, imperfectly constructed, with rooms of the smallest possible dimensions, circled round public works whose huge chimneys belched out black torrents of smoke, or lined the banks of streams that once gleamed in the sunlight, but now rolled along thick with the pollution of factories. In cities like London, Manchester, and Liverpool, and in numerous towns of the provinces that attracted to them a share of the growing industries, the richer families migrated to more healthy neighbourhoods, while their old houses were subdivided into what have been called tenement dwellings. In this way many of the poorest workers found accommodation in dwellings, originally built for one family, but now occupied by one family in each room. It was a highly lucrative arrangement for the

Digitized by Google

receiver of rent, and continues to be, but anyone can see that from a sanitary point of view the arrangement was most unfortunate. When this process of overcrowding on limited areas was at its worst, the owners of court-yards and gardens handed them over to 'jerry' builders, who speedily covered them with squalid hovels.

The consequence of this overcrowding was soon made apparent in those epidemics which swept like pestilences into the congested districts of population. Every law of health was plainly broken, but at that time sanitation was an unknown science, and the gospel of cleanliness would have been counted heresy. When an outbreak of smallpox or typhus fever took place in any of these congested centres, the teachers of religion looked upon it as a visitation of Providence. No doubt it was a visitation of Providence, but simply on account of bad drainage. At the time of the cholera, in 1853, the Presbytery of Edinburgh approached Lord Palmerston for the purpose of appointing a national fast, by royal authority, and got this answer: 'Lord Palmerston would suggest that the best course which the people of this country can pursue to deserve that the further progress of the cholera should be stayed, will be to employ the interval that will elapse between the present time and the beginning of next spring in planning and executing measures by which those portions of their towns and cities which are inhabited by the poorer classes, and which from the nature of things must most need purification and improvement, may be freed from those causes and sources of contagion which, if allowed to remain, will infallibly breed pestilence, and be fruitful in death, in spite of all the prayers and fastings of a united but inactive nation. When man has done his utmost for his own safety, then is the time to invoke the blessing of Heaven to give effect to his exertions.' That reproof was all the more justly merited, because Edwin Chadwick, the Missionary of the Sanitary idea, had begun as early as 1828 to demonstrate by numerous facts and arguments that physical surroundings must have an influence on health and length of life; and he

Digitized by Google

had, in his first Report on the Health of Towns, published in 1848, revealed a state of horrors lying beneath the fair surface of our civilisation that could hardly be conceived, and were due to the neglect of the most ordinary conditions of health.

Of late years the labours of Chadwick have met with entire approval at the hands of every social reformer, and his name will rank as a benefactor with those of Howard and Clarkson. The sanitary movement has become a great fact, and under its direction considerable improvement has, within the last few years, taken place in the Housing of the Poor. There has likewise been a great change in public opinion as to what constitutes healthy requirements, and regarding what condemns a house as unfit for human habitation. Things which would not a few years ago have been thought necessary are now required. Houses are reckoned injurious to health and unfit to be occupied when they are without free space adequate for light and ventilation, when they are without proper ashpit and water-closet accommodation, when the drainage and water supply are dangerous, when noxious effluvia from drains and ashpits pervade dwelling-houses, when walls are damp and roofs are out of repair so as to admit rain, when tenements are so defective in structure or so dilapidated as to be only fit to be pulled down. It would be difficult to specify exactly all the defects—sanitary and structural—of unhealthy residence, but most of them may be found included in the enumeration now given. One defect, if aggravated, may be enough to condemn a house; generally, however, a combination of them alone warrants a pronouncement of unfitness. In determining the question whether a house is absolutely unfitted for human habitation, sometimes the nature and sometimes the number of the defects will need to be taken into account.

Although great benefits have come to the working classes from recent improvements in housing, much still requires to be done. In almost all our large towns the evils of bad housing still exist; there we find districts packed with families, and

Digitized by Google

infested with disease—districts which prove how easy it is to create a hideous problem, and how difficult it is to solve it—districts which seem to be permanently handed over to squalor, misery, and crime. And this state of things, so long as it exists, is a disfigurement and scandal to our civilisation.

The question of housing the people is a national one, for the condition of matters is nearly as bad in the country as in the town. Those who are acquainted with rural districts tell us that the dwellings of poor peasants are often no better than third-rate pigsties. A writer on Arcady—and he is no declaimer against landlords—mentions that the deterioration in our agricultural labourers is due, among other things, to living in 'hovels which the raggedest tramp would shun; . . . hovels which the Local Board of any borough in the kingdom would condemn in a week as unfit for human habitation, are, in a thousand instances, the only places that our country people can lay their heads in; they are all the more horrible, because such people quietly acquiesce in their lot, and make no complaints.' A commissioner of the *Daily News* has recently contributed to that paper a series of letters upon village life in England, and describing a cottage that he saw, he says: 'Such a house inside I never saw in my life, though I think I have seen a good many of the worst rooms in London. The poor woman begged we would go upstairs and look at the front bedroom. She had to move out of it, she said, for she was afraid her bedstead would have tumbled through into the room below. This was not in the least an exaggeration. I really felt it unsafe to stand upon the floor. The walls were cracked and broken. Throughout the house they were patched with tarred sacking or bits of sheet iron. The roof was leaky, and rain was free to come in from above, and all the winds of heaven had free course through broken floors and ramshackle windows; and that unfortunate family had had to shiver in that miserable ruin—condemned twelve months ago—all through the last dreadful winter. "I was nearly perished to death, sir," said the poor woman, "and

Digitized by Google

they have been threatening to put the brokers in for the rates. Can they do it, sir, for a place like this?"' There is no hope in the peasant's dilapidated cottage; it has no outlook, no future in it. The only chance is to get away from it—a chance possible only to the young and healthy, and so the stream of immigration flows on unchecked to the towns.

But the tumble-down hovels of the hamlets are not so bad as the town-slums. For the poor cottagers have the pure breath of heaven about them, and are not tempted to hide their refuse under the bed, while they are comparatively free from the abundance of vermin that infest the houses of the poor in towns. Terrible dwellings are to be found in great centres of population like London, Liverpool, and Glasgow, and in many old towns throughout the provinces. The state of matters in the East End of London has long been before the public. Such publications as *The Labour and Life of the People*, and the Annual Reports of the Mansion House Council, photograph to the public gaze places in London that are squalid beyond description, and must be fruitful hotbeds of disease and death. Mrs. Jeune, a faithful friend of the poor, gave, in the *Fortnightly Review*, an account of some houses in a court in Bethnal Green: 'On three sides the court was overshadowed by high houses, on one side by a factory. There was no air, the floors were full of rat holes, the walls were running down with damp, the sanitary arrangements were out of order, there was no regular supply of water in the closets, and in this Arcadia there were twenty houses containing about thirty families, paying on an average four shillings a week in rent per room.' This same lady lately made a remarkable statement in open court at Worship Street with reference to certain Shoreditch abominations: 'All over London the sanitary authorities have grossly neglected their duties, heedless of consequences to the poor and the community at large. Those who labour among the indigent find that the greatest difficulty standing in the way of rendering them efficient and permanent aid is due to the shocking insanitary conditions in which so many working men and women have to live.

Digitized by Google

Unhealthy and unclean homes, made so by the avarice or callousness of owners of slum dwellings, stultify the most strenuous efforts of persons who strive to make the lives of hardworking folk brighter, purer, and happier. Not only grown-up people are deleteriously affected by insanitary conditions of home life. The bad influence of vile surroundings acts as a social canker, poisoning the minds and bodies alike of children as well as adults.' In Glasgow a Commission was recently appointed to inquire into the Housing of the Poor in relation to their social condition, to gather and classify facts, and to suggest remedies. The Report of that Commission was published in 1891. It gives prominence to the fact that Glasgow was the first among great cities to deal with the Housing of the Poor and rectify clamant evils, and at the same time points out that the measure of success attending the Improvement Trust efforts has left matters for some years stationary, and that the time has come for still greater efforts in the same direction. That there is room for further improvements is shown by the evidence of Dr. Russell, who states that in the Blythswood district of the city the death-rate for three years averaged 16·1, but in Cowcaddens thirty-two, and in the worst district, the Bridgegate, 38·3. The death-rate of children is thirty-eight per thousand in Bridgegate, and in the districts of larger houses it is only sixteen or seventeen, while, of the children who die in Glasgow before they complete their fifth year, thirty-two per cent. are in one apartment and not two per cent. in houses of five apartments.

Out of 122,600 dwelling-houses in the city, 36,000 are of one apartment, and about 55,000 have two apartments. It is estimated that 120,000 persons live in one-room houses. There are 23,228 'ticketed houses' of one and two rooms—the tickets on the door or lintel stating how many inmates may legally occupy each house at a rate of three hundred cubic feet for each person over eight years. The standard of space has been raised under the recent Police Act to four hundred. A night inspector attached to the Sanitary Office gives a realistic

Digitized by Google

picture of what he found among the people, decent and dissolute, who occupy those ticketed houses.

'No. 1 was the house of a labourer, with his wife, two children, aged respectively two years and three months, and the wife's brother. The family of four lay on an old mattress on the floor of a recessed bed-space, while the wife's brother lay in a corner of the house, with an old sack covering him. There was very little furniture in the house—an old table, a form, and a few dishes. The cubic contents—761 feet—allowed for two persons, but five persons were in that house. No. 2 opposite was the house of a blind man, who lived with his wife and two children. His wife is employed in a hair factory, and he sells laces at the street corners. The only furnishings a broken box and a few old pieces of delf. There was a bed recess, without bearers or bottoms, and all lay there on the floor with very little to cover them. The rent seven shillings a month. The people were sober. No. 5 occupied by a blacksmith and his wife, who lay in bed with very little covering over them. A small barrel, with a board on the top, served as a table; and a broken chair and a few dishes were the only articles visible. The husband had been ill and unable to work. That is the house of a poor but industrious man. No. 16 Coburg Street is a tenement with twelve one-room houses and three two-room houses, and is the worst block for overcrowding in the city. I have found as many as thirty-three persons there in excess of the standard in one night. In one house a carter and his wife were lying in bed, the man under the influence of drink. Their two children lay on the floor in front of the bed on a shake-down, along with an aunt, a young woman of twenty-three. The house was overcrowded, four being found, when the capacity only allowed two. Rent, nine shillings and sixpence a month.'

We cannot dwell on other facts of overcrowding contained in this Report.

When we analyse a part of the population in London or Glasgow to find out the social conditions and surroundings of the poor, it is no wide generalisation to infer that proportionately

Digitized by Google

the same state of things will be discovered elsewhere. Social reformers tell us that every town of any size has an 'East End,' and presents the problem of defective housing. Take the condition of things in a provincial town well known to the author. An increase of better houses, while giving more agreeable surroundings to many well-to-do families, has left to a worse class of tenants the old and worn-out houses without sanitary appliances. Behind the principal thoroughfare there is a condition of things which answers too nearly to the 'rookeries' and 'slums' of large cities in the land. A series of 'closes,' long and narrow, presents a very unattractive vista to anyone passing along the main street and looking up. Few of the respectable inhabitants care to go up, but to those who consider the poor, and wish to better their lot, a voyage of adventure among these 'closes' is at once a duty, and would be a help. On what were once pigsties and strips of garden, rows of hovels have been erected to meet the demand for housing, and they have been put up at a time when no attention was paid to sanitation. The minimum amount of open space and light has been allowed, and the greatest number of rooms has been aimed at, so as to bring the largest increment of rent. The lanes of houses are so narrow, or so bounded by walls, that the space between sometimes does not admit a walking-stick lengthways, or it may be spanned by the right and left foot. Consequently, there is a want of ventilation, and tenements looking out on dead walls are insufficiently lighted. Where direct sunlight never reaches, what can the result be but dull, cheerless abodes? The house accommodation in these back-lands is, in many cases, neither structurally weather-proof nor sanitary as to arrangements within or without, nor adequate to the requirements of decency and cleanliness. The presence of ashpits is another ugly feature of the situation. One of these may be seen in the midst of a court, full of every kind of refuse and filth, and diffusing its foul odours all around. As the ashpits are not bottomed with cement, the fluid mixtures come soaking through in a foul, creamy, fungoid colour on the surface, and blue stuff beneath,

Digitized by Google

teeming with microbes. These insanitary groups of dwellings are the breeding-places of typhoid, diphtheria, and scarlet fever. When the scavengers go into these regions, they do not always clear away the filth; they too often only spread it. An epidemic of typhoid fever began in one of these closes; and as the first case that occurred was not properly isolated, an uncle of the party took the same fever, and then the father. The children of these slums are our street arabs, and plenty of them with shanky limbs and pasty faces scour the streets. Tidy families may be found in these squalid haunts, but they are exceptions. Drunkenness, dirt, profane swearing, brutality, and crime prevail there. Drink is the luxury, and the chief excitement is a row in the street or a brawl in the back-court.

Pass inside a few of these habitations. No. 1 is a little shanty at the far end of a close, occupied by a riveter and caulker to trade, who can earn thirty-two shillings a week in busy times, but out of work since summer. His wife has been bedridden for three years with rheumatism. A shabby table and three chairs are about all the articles of furniture.

No. 2 is a single room, with the roof seven feet high, and the greatest length twelve feet; the walls are damp on both sides of a box bed; one window looks out on a dead wall, and another looks out on an ashpit. A family of seven persons inhabits this room.

No. 3 is a dingy apartment upstairs; it has one window firmly fastened to keep out the offensive smell of an ashpit which escapes by a ventilator placed in a slate roof immediately under the window. There is a press in the wall, but nothing could be kept in it owing to heavy smells which rise up into it from a second ashpit below it.

No. 4 is another single room of limited dimensions, and occupied by eight persons: a husband and wife, who have two unmarried daughters, and one of them has four children. There are two beds, and the smell in the room is often so sickening that our Christian visitor cannot enter.

Digitized by Google

No. 5 is a room from wall to wall, with windows opposite. One window might afford enough of light if looking out into open space, but both windows look out on dead walls, and leave the inside quite dark. The roof is about six feet high. There is a recess-bed, with another close by across the room. An old Irish widow lives here, and her only means of livelihood are derived from two lodgers—one of them 'on the street' and the other a farm labourer. Rent of this room, six shillings and sixpence a month.

No. 6 is a tenement. On the ground floor is a little shop, and leading off the shop is an apartment which, again, is the only way of approach to a back room. I could touch the roof of the apartment with my head, by standing on tiptoe. It has one window about eighteen inches broad; on the other side of it is the fire-place; and on the other side of the fire-place it is so dark that articles of furniture cannot be distinguished. The room is best lighted at night when the lamp is lit. There is access to it from the close by an opening so narrow that the tenant can hardly pass through it. For these three places—two rooms and a shop—the rent is £12. The six-feet-high roof has threatened to give way, and wooden props are stuck up in different parts of the apartment. In the attics of this tenement, reached by an outside stone stair, then by a dark inside stair, which must be mounted delicately, are four rooms or apartments, the doors to which are only discoverable by a few chinks of light from the rafters of the roof. Each door was knocked at. The second was fastened by a cord, which I unloosed, and found the room empty. A dreary, dilapidated room it is. On knocking at the third door, a rough voice sharply asked, 'Who's there?' and on answering, 'I have come to make a call,' the querist came and locked the door, and bade me call another time. The fourth door I opened, and looked into a hole of a place with a collection of lumber.

If house-to-house inspection were at all attempted, pictures like these could be furnished almost to any extent; only there are dark touches that we dare not mention.

Digitized by Google

Enough has been adduced to show that the problem of proper housing is with us, and that the duty of the hour, on the part of Church and State alike, is to provide dwellings where decency and self-respect, cleanliness and comfort, might at least be possible. While things remain as they are in our towns and cities, they are a shameful blot on our boasted industry, and upon nineteen centuries of Christianity. How they have come about, or who is to blame for them, are really questions that should never be asked or aimed at anyone. Blame attaches to nobody, so far as the past is concerned. The only people to be blamed are those who close their eyes and lips when brought face to face with such a problem. They are without excuse who sit at their ease in Zion, while such evil in the city cries to be put right. It is all very well to congratulate the better working classes over the great amelioration of their lot, and to point to their trim cottages with their own plot of ground; we hail those smiling homesteads with our whole heart! But too many of the people are wretchedly housed, and such is the actual condition of things not very far from where Christian worshippers sit under their own vine and fig-tree in comfort and peace. When anyone starts a crusade to win back proper dwelling-places for living men, God forbid that we should take up the *laissez-faire* cry, 'Can he not let things alone? he is stirring up discontent; he must be stopped or he will be a perpetual nuisance.' Thorold Rogers assures us that the housing of the working classes is an urgent social evil which no return to equity will cure for a generation, or two generations, it may be; and if that be true, the test of sincerity and earnestness in the work of improved houses is to be found, first of all, in a willingness on our part to turn the bull's eye of a careful inspection upon the darkest side of the problem, and thus make ourselves acquainted with the worst condition of things, wherever they may be. We do not cure the wrongs and miseries of the people by ignoring them, but by studying them closely and gauging them accurately.

Information on the subject should be diligently gathered and

Digitized by Google

widely circulated, in order to create a strong public opinion. Some practical grievances cannot be more effectively attacked than by a mere statement of the facts in the plainest and least argumentative terms; the community has only to be made aware of these plague-spots in the heart of our towns and cities to accentuate the demand for a better state of things.

If this lamentable condition in regard to the dwellings of the poor is to be amended, all parties and all efforts should be united to cope with the difficulties in the way of improvement. The sympathy of all classes of possible helpers is needed for an effectual solution of the problem. Workers among the poor may render most valuable service by making a thorough house-to-house visitation of their districts, and ascertaining the sanitary defects which exist there. A far larger number of Christian people should volunteer to act as visitors, though it were for no other purpose but to assist in the work of improving the dwellings of the poor. The latter are glad when anyone goes down to take notice of the way in which they live, and to express a wish that something may be done to better their lot. The rich, too, should serve in this cause. The rich are bound to the poor, and, it may be, owe something of their wealth and abundance to what the hands of the poor have wrought. There are moments of reflection in which the possessors of wealth might be disposed to allow that the occupants of these grimy and dismal houses have helped to build their elegant mansions. If the inhabitants of the slums have had a share in producing the great fortunes of industry and commerce, it is surely the duty of the fortunate rich to make themselves acquainted with how the unfortunate poor are housed. The gulf between rich and poor, already too great, could thus be bridged. Let the rich visit the homes and haunts of the poor, and see the state of things; let them explore the lanes and alleys, and more particularly the houses in which the poorest of the poor and the lowest of the low dwell, and they will learn to what uses their superfluous wealth may be turned, and that not in the form of doles that only serve to

Digitized by Google

pauperise, but in the form of habitations that will conduce to a dignified life.

The landlords, also, should be enlisted in this crusade. If the houses of the poor are to be improved, and their surroundings made wholesome, an effort should be used to carry the landlords with us. It is often said that they are so interested in the condemned property, and so blinded by self-interest, that they can offer nothing but the most strenuous opposition to any reform. We do not wish to extenuate the mischief of that influence, but in our desire to take all parties along with us, we express our concurrence with the Glasgow Commissioners on the Housing of the Poor, that 'landlords, like every other class, ought to be fairly and justly dealt with.' They suffer more than the public know from tenants who are filthy and destructive in their habits, and who, after committing damage to property, can only be removed by a tedious and expensive process of ejectment. Such malicious destruction ought to be punished like an act of theft or any other criminal offence, and the process of ejectment should be made cheap and summary.

While we are bound to take account of tenants' faults, and bear in mind that people make their surroundings like themselves, the owners of these poor dwellings ought to feel that a very great responsibility rests upon them in having such property, and to look fairly at any schemes by which decent housing can be provided for the lower classes. For conditions of the operative's life in those filthy dwellings, to which public attention is now so urgently called, and about the hideous reality of which no doubt can be entertained, landlords are much to be blamed; and it would be as creditable to them as it would be beneficial to the poor if they let these evils come home to the conscience, and united with such as are striving to improve the lot of the poor. If they hold their property in such bad order as to be unhealthy or unfit to dwell in, they should be classed with sellers of unsound meat, and treated with the utmost rigours of the law.

Digitized by Google

The Christian citizen should bring his sense of Christian citizenship to bear upon this question. As one who prays for the coming of the kingdom of God, and strives to have God's will done on earth as it is done in heaven, he recognises that it is the mission of the Christian Church, by the power of her blessed Gospel, to regenerate the individual and fashion society after a higher pattern. He believes that the *characters* of men are of still greater importance than their *conditions*, and that a high personal ideal may grow in lowly and even squalid surroundings: but he acknowledges, at the same time, to the full that a moral element lies in good housing and sanitary regulation and open spaces. Moral remedies are, undoubtedly, most valid in curing the diseases of the social system, and without them physical remedies are almost worse than useless; but spiritual appliances, again, are so hindered in the present state of things as to be almost impossible, and therefore the sense of Christian citizenship — of justice, trusteeship, and brotherhood—demands a more commodious environment for the poor.

All these parties are called upon, in the energy and disinterestedness of their civic life, to unite their counsels and suggestions, their exertions and enterprises, in removing this social malady. We are all of one mind that the Housing of the Poor is among the most urgent of social reforms. What is to be done is clear. Next to the abolition of the drink traffic stands in importance the solution of the problem: 'With a due regard to all interests, where and how are the poor to be decently housed within fairly easy reach of their work?' To carry home that question still further to the conscience of the community, we must study the subject in all its bearings, and especially in those aspects which intelligently move the springs of human sympathy and effort. The problem is, as we have seen, considerably aggravated by the filthy and degraded habits of the poor, but that view need not shut out a recognition of other causes which have had not a little to do in breeding the 'cussedness' we censure and deplore. It is often debated

Digitized by Google

whether drink leads to overcrowding and bad houses, or whether overcrowding or bad houses lead to drink, and the most complete answer is to hold that both are true. They act and react powerfully upon one another. Drink feeds the slums, fills our back-lands, and keeps them unwholesome and demoralising. A sober man, however hard his lot may be from other causes, does not need to land there. It is rare to meet with a teetotaller living in a single room of a slum dwelling; while the occupant of a hovel inevitably finds, not only escape but comfort and luxury in the public-house. If he has a sixpence or a copper which in pity you gave him, at once he hurries out of his dirty lair to spend it in drink. Bad housing is answerable for a vast amount of the prevailing intemperance. The one industry that never flags in the poorer districts, according to the Royal Commission of 1884, is that connected with the gin-palace and the beer-house.

The main causes of overcrowding and other evils are to be found in the movements of population at a great rate from the country to the town, in the glut of the labour-market, in the uncertainty of employment, and in the precarious condition of wages, all leading to that phase of extreme poverty which hides away in the poorer districts of our towns and cities. The continued depletion of the country and the continued rapid growth of the towns are the most striking lessons of the recent census. People in the present day prefer a town to a country life, even though ~~the preference~~ drifts them into the slums; ~~and of course such~~ a drift tends to make the problem of housing ~~acute~~. We have a proof of this in the high rents that are paid in congested and insanitary districts. In such quarters of London eighty-eight per cent. of the poor pay more than one-fifth of their income in rent, and forty-two per cent. pay from one-fourth to one-fifth. It is not always extreme poverty that drives the inhabitants into single, overcrowded rooms, but the exorbitant prices charged for such accommodation. Few house-rents are so high as those in our back-courts. The occupant of a mansion pays a lower nightly rent, in proportion to space

Digitized by Google

occupied, and cubic feet of air he breathes, than does the miserable urchin who spends threepence for permission to stow himself under the bed of a low lodging-house. Little though many of us see or dream of it, the condition in which many of our fellow-citizens are housed is sickening and horrible; they occupy infamous haunts no human being ought to be born in, ought to live in, ought to die in. Those sunless lives and cheerless abodes, with all the drunkenness, squalor, and misery brought in their train, are enough to use up all the thought and effort and charity we can muster. If this state of affairs is to be set right, it must be grappled with on a far larger scale than has yet been done, and some lasting solution for it must be devised. In provincial towns, where the problem is acute, hardly any public opinion exists, and the evil continues unchecked. The Mansion House Council in London with such names as the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, and the Marquis of Salisbury for its office-bearers, the Social Union of Edinburgh, and the Social Union of Glasgow, have been formed to grapple with this problem, and they issue annual reports of successful and encouraging work in improving the dwellings of the poor. The Mansion House Council has, besides a large executive, a central sanitary aid committee, and local committees for every district of the city in which insanitary conditions are to be found. It inspects streets and condemns such tenements as are unfit to be inhabited; it strives to awaken Local Bodies to a sense of their duties, and keeps up the agitation until the condemned houses are improved or swept away. Urgent need exists for a growing public sentiment on defective houses in other places, and for the creation of Councils and Unions to take in hand the great question of the Housing of the Poor. There ought to be a serious study of this Social Question, an enlightened public opinion regarding it, a proper organisation of local charities in view of it, and a gathering together into one body of all the best citizens—working men as well as gentlemen of position—a union of them in one strong phalanx to deal effectively with this common social foe.

Digitized by Google

'Nothing short of a much-widely-spread combination of effort on behalf of local ratepayers, gentlemen of courage and independence, willing to take part in the management of local affairs, will ever bring about the desired result.'[1] The initiative in such a movement ought to come from gentlemen of weight in the town; they should enter the field, and lead the campaign, and gather the forces of social reform into one.

If such a combination were secured, half the difficulty would disappear, and at once half the work would be done. The atmosphere would be cleared of administrative indolence, of corrupt connivance, of resigned despair, and would be charged with an enlightenment and an awakenment of public opinion sure to result in new efficiency of administration by Local Authorities and in great benefit to the dwellings of the poor.

The Legislature has not been blind to the dangers of overcrowding and unhealthy surroundings. A series of laws known as Torrens Acts, and passed in 1868 and 1879, provided for gradually improving or demolishing workmen's houses, and for building new ones. Cross's Acts passed at different dates dealt with whole areas of houses that are so defective as to be incapable of repair or so ill-placed by closeness with one another as to require entire reconstruction or immediate removal. All these Acts have been repealed in favour of 'Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890,' which consolidates previous legislation, and does little more than render obligatory certain powers that were only permissible before. It deals with 'unhealthy areas,' such as any houses, courts, or alleys unfit for human habitation, or causing diseases on account of the closeness, or narrowness, or bad arrangement of streets and houses within such areas; and empowers Local Authorities to consider any official representation from a Medical Officer to such an effect, and, if satisfied of the truth of the same, to proceed with an improvement scheme. It deals with 'unhealthy premises,'

[1] *Report of the Mansion House Council*, 1890.

Digitized by Google

making it the duty of the Medical Officer to inform the Local Authority of any premises that are unhealthy and unfit to live in. Further, it requires the Local Authority to make, from time to time, an inspection with a view to find out any dwelling-house injurious to health or uninhabitable, and on finding such a house to forthwith take proceedings against the owner or occupier to have it closed. After a closing order they may resolve on the demolition of the building. 'Obstructive buildings,' such as stop ventilation, or otherwise prove injurious, may be dealt with in the same way, but with more tenderness to the owners. Such powers as these, conferred by Act of Parliament, ought to be exercised by the Local Body in order to secure anything like health, cleanliness, and decency in congested districts.

The Consolidation Act of 1890 gives large enabling powers to Medical Officers of Health and Local Authorities in dealing with unfit habitations, and to householders who may complain of any dwelling-place in a condition injurious to health. It is the duty of the Medical Officer to represent to the Local Authority any dwelling-place which appears to him to be in a state so dangerous or injurious to health as to be unfit for habitation; and if four or more householders living in or near to any street complain in writing to the Medical Officer 'of any such dwelling-house in or near that street, he shall forthwith inspect the same and transmit to the Local Authority the said complaint, together with his opinion thereon.' It is also enacted that if after three months the Local Authority declines to take any proceedings to put the Act in force, the complaining householders 'may petition the Local Government Board for an inquiry, and the said Board shall thereupon direct an inquiry, and may order the Local Authority to proceed under this part of the Act, and such order shall be binding on the Local Authority.' Under such ample provisions, any Local Body determined on executing them to the maximum of its powers may secure decided improvements, but such a series of enactments, as anyone may see at a glance, only affords endless opportunity for

Digitized by Google

evasion and neglect. The dwellers in slums are too demoralised to seek any redress, and when will 'four or more householders near' ever be got to complain? The Medical Officer may pronounce a dwelling, or series of dwellings, not to be 'in a state so dangerous or injurious to health as to be unfit for human habitation,' and yet they may be without the common decencies of existence, and the effect upon morals be appalling; or if he is afraid of the corporation, who may dismiss him at their caprice or pleasure, he connives at the evil. Inspectors are appointed, and they do not inspect; or if they do, they dare not report the plain facts. Local Authorities will not use the discretionary powers conferred upon them, and so the Amendment Act of 1890, like previous Acts, is a dead letter, and next to nothing is done for the better housing of the working classes. So long as enactments are optional in their application they will be evaded and left inoperative. If the Act be only permissive, if it be all in the language of 'may,' and not of 'shall,' the landlords who have become rich by the marrow and fatness of the slums will defy it, and the authorities who should administer it will refuse to take action. If the Local Bodies had been *compelled* to adopt this Act in all its integrity, it is not too much to say that the slums would have gone; but so long as the Act shrinks from compulsion, the slums will remain.

What is to be done, then, in the face of this permissive and abortive legislation? A writer in the *Economic Review* for July 1892 well expresses our duty when he says that 'the pulpit and the press must never cease to agitate until laws which are now permissive, and are therefore freely set at nought, are made compulsory; until all Medical Officers and Inspectors of Nuisances cease to be the servants of vestries and municipalities, and are made independent of all Local Authorities, responsible alone to the Government for what they do or leave undone. The appalling evil—moral, social, and physical—of things as they are almost universally throughout England is defiling bodies and damning souls. There is a cry for millions to be

Digitized by Google

born again, and the midwives of the slums slay them as they come to the birth. "The better housing of the poor" is on every platform solemnly pronounced to be "the question of the hour." Has the clock stopped; for it always points to midnight to the minute? That all men are agreed, and that yet nothing is done, is the inevitable and only logical outcome of permissive legislation.'

While it may be expedient to make the best of things as they are, and encourage voluntary and associated effort in providing houses for the poor, at rents within their reach, there are other reforms to which in a spirit of equity the action of the State should be directed, and there are improvements which it should be the function of the Municipality to attempt. The State, while having to guard against pauperising the people, must intervene to help the helpless out of their squalid surroundings, and such help can be given by simplifying the laws of land transfer and reducing the charges connected with this procedure. 'Mr. Forwood stated that £72,000, which was paid in compensation for 635 insanitary houses in Liverpool, was out of all proportion to what the owners were morally entitled to; but the sum of £10,000 paid to lawyers for their legal charges in connection with the same transaction was a much more surprising figure.'[1] Sometimes these legal expenses amount to more than one-third the value of the land transferred, and should be much reduced in the interest of building workmen's houses. Still more ought the 'unearned increment' to be utilised for the welfare of the community that creates it. Honest investigation of the causes that have brought about the present distress always points to the exorbitant price of land as that which makes building costly and rents high. Legislation is necessary to secure a thorough reform of land values. The present law of rating also tends to discourage the building of small houses in towns, and adds to the difficulties great enough in housing the necessitous parts of the population. It is a question of rating the right people, and surely the burden ought

[1] F. H. Millington, *Housing of the Poor*.

Digitized by Google

to be laid not on the occupier alone, but on the building landlord and still more on the owner of the land, who, without any effort on his part, gets all the value which land receives from the growth of population. The ground-rents should at a certain date pass from the landlord into a common fund for remodelling unhealthy areas. By reforming these matters, State interference could do much to forward the work of building societies.

Municipalities could also be worthily engaged in the provision of new dwellings as well as in a rigid enforcement of sanitary regulations. Glasgow furnishes the best example of this kind in the United Kingdom. By its Improvement Trust bad property, to the amount of 10,000 houses, has been cleared away, new and wider streets have been formed, and thoroughfares now run through areas once covered by rookeries. All this has cost the ratepayers £552,000, for which they have obtained sanitary and social amenities which it would have been worth double that sum to secure. The better effects in the moral elevation of the poor cannot be estimated. Dwellings for the labouring classes might thus be provided by municipal bodies in other towns.

There is scope almost without limit for private enterprise in carrying out such improvements. Professor Marshall makes this suggestion: 'There is perhaps no better use of public and private money than in providing public parks and playgrounds in large cities, in contracting with railways to increase the number of the workmen's trains run by them, and in helping those of the working classes who are willing to leave the large towns to do so, and to take their industries with them.' Miss Octavia Hill's work among the homes of the London poor illustrates the good results of private enterprise, when properly organised and put on commercial lines. By undertaking personally the management of houses in the worst parts of London, and letting them to the poorest families, and combining with firmness in the collection of rents a kindly interest in the cleanliness and comfort of their homes, this lady has done a work which gives her

Digitized by Google

a foremost place in the ranks of philanthropy. The Glasgow Commissioners on the Housing of the Poor acknowledge the difficulty of erecting proper houses, and letting them at £5 and £8 for one and two rooms respectively, yet they recommend the formation of a company to purchase and reconstruct existing tenements which are insanitary and out of repair. If the corporation put in force the powers conferred on it, and forced old properties into the market so that they could be bought at a fair price, the existence of such an association could push forward the improvement of overcrowded and insanitary areas.

What is wanted is intelligent co-operation of the forces of social reform, so as to set forth without fear or favour where people are living in rooms that are a disgrace to all who are responsible for them, and so as to devise the means of a healthier and happier state of life for the toiling poor. Instead of these poky, low-roofed, and miserable hovels, there should be rows of cottages standing out in the light and in open space, with a background of vegetables and fruit-trees and a foreground of shrubs and flowers; or, hard by, there should be pieces of ground like the Hutchesontown Gardens in Glasgow, laid out in six or ten-pole plots at the rate of two shillings and sixpence per pole, where the cottagers could fence and cultivate their plots at their pleasure. Instead of single, overcrowded, and indecent rooms, there should be no single rooms except for single persons or couples. There is no reason why, on leaving our thoroughfares and passing through our closes, we should not emerge on such lovely combinations of the city and the garden; and if through cupidity and inhumanity we place them among the might-have-beens of the past, let us resolve to place them among the must-bes of the good time coming. We ought to have a high ideal of general well-being. To find a city of brick and change it into marble is nothing compared with a transformation of town or city from dirt, disease, and degradation to cleanliness, health, and at least a decent morality.

Digitized by Google

But if we are to arrive at this idea of being as healthy and free, prosperous and happy, as life can well be in a world like ours, we must be 'all at it, at it always, and at it altogether.' All the citizens, be they Conservative or Liberal, master or workman, rich or poor,—all ought to clasp hands of brotherhood in such an enterprise. To forward it is the great work of the Church and the State, the school and the Town Council, the platform and the printing-press. To prate as though it cannot be done is to betray a want of faith in God and man.

To keep aloof from the task is to deserve the curse of Meroz, is to sin against our fellowmen.

The call to take an interest in the cause should press with keenness on the consciences of the rich.

It needs the generous efforts and noble sacrifices of those who have money to spend and do not grudge to spend it on others than themselves. The Peabody Trust and the great House and Dwellings Companies show what the munificent donations of the rich can do for this object, and those liberal things are still needed to provide habitations for the very poor. A new force has risen up in the modern world—the accumulation of large capitals, the influence of vast riches; it is a power which may be used to handicap Labour or lift it to a more dignified life. Rich people who do not want to live selfishly are asking everywhere: 'Will anyone tell us how to use our wealth in making people happy?' Let them be ready with a thousand pounds, or more, to improve the dwellings of the poor, and let a dozen or twenty or a hundred of them elsewhere do the same till the slums are changed into 'sure dwellings and quiet resting-places.' The rich should make conscience of this as 'the work of righteousness,' which the spirit of the time expects. Men are taking note that wealth has all run to one end, while many of the people who helped to make it are still very destitute; that the capitalist has got too much and the labourer has got too little; and surely among many means of reaching a better adjustment should be counted, the instruction of Christ that

Digitized by Google

bids the rich think of themselves not as proprietors but as stewards of the wealth entrusted to them, and to be laid out not only in money payments for wages but in great services for the good of the people.

The call to take an interest in this cause appeals to the Church with the power of Christ's compassion for the multitude. Unwholesome houses are the plague of our towns and villages, and they are spots on our feasts of charity. In the estimate of all who know them it is almost a mockery to preach temperance, thrift, and chastity, until a better environment makes better lives possible. We should try to establish those material improvements which are the most solid basis of moral attainments. The Church must recognise the moulding power of fresh air, of healthy homes, of cleanly habits. Spiritual work will not be hindered by closer attention to the demands of health, decency, and comfort. The conversion of a hovel into a home need not obstruct the conversion of souls, nor will the removal of dampness from the houses of the poor make a preacher's sermons dry.

The call to take an interest in this cause should penetrate to the inmates of those unfortunate abodes. It should awaken hope in them to know that so many of their best fellow-citizens are thinking of their unsafe houses and anxious to provide for them 'sure dwellings.' If the work of righteousness is begun in these dismal tenements, 'the effect of righteousness shall be quietness and assurance for ever.' Yes, even there, if the heads of the family be righteous, their humble, ill-situated cabin will be trim enough for a queen to sit down in. What makes the problem so difficult, and indeed almost hopeless, in these low houses, is due to the dirty habits and disreputable ways of the tenants. One can hardly exaggerate the filth and degradation of the people themselves. Reform in manners and habits must go hand in hand with the improvement of houses. Efforts must, therefore, be made to secure vital changes of character by bringing the Gospel home to the poor, so as to alter their habits, soften their manners, and encourage them in the way of well-

Digitized by Google

doing. We may hear the conclusion of the whole matter in the prophet's message to our time: 'The work of righteousness shall be peace; the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance for ever. My people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting-places.'

Digitized by Google

XI.

THE SWEATING SYSTEM.

In the writing of the prophet Isaiah reference is made to most of the Social Problems that loom into view before the wider knowledge and growing earnestness of our closing century. The prophet had in his time a Land Question and a Liquor Question pressing upon his heart in their most acute and painful forms, nor did the Labour Question weigh less heavily with him, as we learn from that sharp reproof which he administered to the employers of his time: 'Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labours,' or as it might be rendered, 'Ye overtask all your workers.' As a teacher standing in close relations to the vices and needs of his age, he had an eye that was quick to note the characteristic features of the society in which he lived, and a tongue that was ready to denounce the evils he saw around him, and a hand that was strong 'to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free.' 'Cry aloud, spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show My people their transgressions.' Is there to-day a social wrong of the same kind among us? Can we point to an overtasking of the labourers in our country? The answer to that question has been formulated into one opprobrious phrase—the Sweating System. The student of social reform discovers everywhere a strong temptation to subordinate the well-being of work-people to the desire for gain, and knows that, in an era of unrestricted

Digitized by Google

competition like our own, the workers are apt to be overworked, while in certain industries they toil on for one-half or three-fourths of their lives at starvation wages till they lie down to die. In this wonderful land of ours, the triumphs of whose industry find no match in ancient or modern times, there are busy workers in horrible dens stitching seventeen hours a day, and earning one shilling; girls who receive one penny for sewing one hundred button-holes; five farthings for making a shirt; children pasting match-boxes from half-past six in the morning till ten at night, and earning five shillings for a whole week's work. If such low industrial conditions of life form a characteristic feature of our time, surely the prophets of God have fallen asleep at their post, or forgotten their high calling, if they do not cry aloud: 'Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and overtask all your labourers.' The lot of labour, it is certain, will continue in the present dispensation of things to be sufficiently severe; but such grinding conditions, wherever they exist, are so contrary to the ordinances of justice that they ought to be mitigated, and if possible removed.

This overwork was nicknamed the 'Sweating System,' in connection with the tailoring trade, when houses began to give out work for execution at home by those who were anxious to work overtime. As these parties could obtain the help of their wives and daughters, in course of time many orders executed on the premises of tailoring establishments, and within fixed hours, passed into the hands of home-workers, and the regular journeymen, among themselves, contemptuously described the action of those workers as sweating. Soon, others than members of the family came to be employed, and the first workers who began by sweating themselves went on to sweat the outsiders whom they employed. The sweating of others led to a wider meaning of the term. At this stage the chief feature of the system consisted in excessive hours of labour, but as it continued to evolve under conditions of a plentiful supply of labour and complete freedom from inspection, the additional features of low wages and insanitary workshops and

Digitized by Google

tyrannical conduct on the part of sub-contractors or middlemen, came gradually into view. A still larger signification was given to the word when inquiry revealed a similar state of things in other trades, such as boot-making, cabinet-making, and where women and children are engaged. The phrase is now commonly understood to describe any process of grinding down wages to the line of bare subsistence. It has come in a picturesque way to hit off many evils of our competitive industrial system that could not very easily be defined; and as the evils, many of them sad and horrible enough, lurked under the surface, popular imagination sought to head them up in some outstanding employer connected with the sweated trades, and then proceeded to stigmatise him as a monster of iniquity. When proper investigation was made, it often turned out that so far from being a typical sweater he was found to be treating his workmen quite fairly both as to hours and wages. The occurrence of such popular mistakes, side by side with the fact that great evils did exist, only showed the need for thorough inquiry, and at length a Committee of the House of Lords on 'the Sweating System' undertook to clear away the ambiguity which existed in the public mind regarding it. In the evidence laid before that Committee proof was given of the confusion of mind which often prevails as to intricate social problems. Causes were confounded with symptoms, and accidental features were viewed as essential counts in the system. Witnesses had so many ways of looking at it that no fewer than twenty-five definitions of 'Sweating' were given in evidence. This being the case, we shall not attempt to define so complicated a phenomenon, but shall examine the working of the system in a few industries, as we can now do from a study of the Lords' Report, and of private inquiries made by Charles Booth, Miss Potter, David Schloss, and other writers, whose articles form the chief contribution to the first volume of Booth's *Labour and Life of the People.*

In the tailoring trade the worst forms of 'Sweating' are to be found, and the East End of London, and that part of it known

Digitized by Google

as Whitechapel, furnishes an area of one square mile as the peculiar sphere of its operations. In this district the Jewish contractor, with a Jewish staff of thirty or forty thousand persons, has a monopoly of the coat-making trade, and still further calls to his aid a mass of Englishwomen, of whose labour he can take advantage, because it is largely unskilled and unorganised. The coat made by an English journeyman for a respectable firm is hand-sewn, and wears well; but the same article made by a Jewish contractor for the wholesale trade is machine-made, and does not fit or wear well. It has been thus described: 'Take the material in one hand, the lining in the other. Pull them apart. Why, it is not a coat at all—it is a balloon. Fill it with gas and hermetically seal the pores of the stuff—and behold "the thing" floats up to heaven, formless and without shape. . . . There is no fit. Walk behind the wearer of a sweater's coat; if the material be light, it will sway to and fro with a senseless motion; if heavy, it bulges out first here, and then there' (*Miss Potter*). These slop garments are made in small workshops, which often are bedrooms and living rooms as well, and have all the symptoms of sweating—bad sanitation, overcrowding, and excessive hours. As Factory Acts and Trade Union regulations have no chance in these domestic workshops, their owners will not only work all night to complete the order, but expect the under-pressers, machinists, and fellers to do the same, and even work for twelve or fifteen hours in return for ten or thirteen hours' wage. Some of the skilled workers in these hybrid workshops are well paid, but those who make one-shilling coats get a maximum of one shilling and sixpence, and a minimum indefinitely below one shilling for a twelve-hours' day. The owners of small workshops are designated 'chamber' or 'garret' masters; they employ a class of apprentices called 'greeners' who are supplied by immigration, and work long hours for starvation wages in the hope of soon rising to the rank of sweaters. Such small masters are the typical sweaters of the clothing trade. There are also go-betweens who take orders from wholesale houses, and dis-

Digitized by Google

tribute the work not only through homes in the city but all over the country. In this 'employment at second-hand,' and scattered far and wide among those who wish to eke out what other means of support they have, the contest between home and workshop is intensified, the opportunity for reducing wages is increased, and the struggle of those who are wholly dependent on this low class of work is aggravated. It is not, therefore, the large employer, with spacious premises and thirty or fifty persons at work in them, who should be credited with the evils of sweating, but the small master who crowds half-a-dozen workmen into his stifling room, keeps driving them to work, and works himself as hard as, or even harder than, any of his employés. Such is the typical sweater of the East End of London, and of such provincial towns as Manchester and Leeds —in the latter place there being about one hundred workshops with all the concomitants of the Sweating System.

In the boot-making trade the same conditions have manifested themselves. For hand-sewn work the skilled hands are fairly well paid, but in the machine-made boots, and the manufacture of fancy shoes and slippers, the sweating-master finds a lucrative field of practice. He may be a chamber-master, who enlists the aid of his own family or employs two or three others in his own house; he may be a laster or a finisher, making use of the 'team system,' a novel subdivision of labour which, by lowering the qualifications of the worker and admitting unskilled labour into the trade, is turned into an instrument for reducing wages. He does, as a laster or finisher, that part of the work which requires the greatest degree of skill, and receives for it adequate remuneration: while his team of three or four is left to do the unskilled work at a much lower rate of wages. Here the sweating system comes in. Hours of work extend from fifteen to eighteen hours a day, and wages are on an average less than eleven shillings a week. Women engaged in making 'felt and carpet uppers' earn with difficulty more than one shilling and threepence a day. 'Sew-round' goods, viz. fancy shoes and slippers, are done for fivepence per dozen pairs, and

Digitized by Google

when from that sum has to be deducted so much for rent of room and hire of sewing-machine, for grindery, light, and firing, it is evident what a pittance must remain. In addition to all this, the sew-round trade continues only six months of the year, and in the machine-sewn branches the busy season in some cases lasts only four months.

The existence of a middleman or 'factor,' taking advantage of the competition among small employers by playing off one against another, has also much to do in the reduction of wages to the lowest point.

The Lords' Committee, in summing up their inquiries connected with this industry, say: 'It will be seen from the foregoing epitome of the evidence, that sweating in the boot trade is mainly traced by the witnesses to the introduction of machinery, and a more complete system of subdivision of labour, coupled with immigration from abroad and foreign competition. Some witnesses have traced it in a great measure, if not principally, to the action of factors; some to excessive competition among small masters as well as men; others have accused the Trade Unions of a course of action which has defeated the end they have in view, namely, effectual combination, by driving work out of the factory into the house of the worker.'

In the furniture trade disintegrating processes have led to the production of inferior work, the introduction of unskilled hands, and the abuses of sweating. The higher branches of cabinet-making under trade regulations still command good wages, but the less skilled work is made by 'garret-masters' in small shops, who 'hawk' their goods or send them to the show-shops of the East End. The growth of wholesale dealers is a feature of the trade, and these dealers generally contract with an outside man to do the polishing and upholstery, to pass the work collected from various hands, and guarantee the quality of the goods; and then, by circulating catalogues or establishing agencies, they supply the market—suburban, provincial, or export—with cheap 'suites' of dining and drawing-room and bedroom furniture.

Digitized by Google

In the multiplication of small domestic shops, where Factory inspection is evaded, in the abundant supply of labour and its want of organisation, in the operations of sub-contract through several stages, in the excessive competition of small makers and the temptation to undersell one another, we recognise industrial forces which produce some of the most distressing features of the Sweating System.

When we come to work done by women we find the evils of this system pressing more severely upon them than upon men. The employment of women in pursuits of business is a marked feature of our time. Census returns show nearly two million women engaged as industrial workers, about the same number in domestic service, and about 70,000 in agriculture. The industrial workers are engaged as tailoresses or shirtmakers; wool, cotton, flax, lace-workers; or milliners and dressmakers. In the last two classes the main body of female labourers is to be found; the number of tailoresses may be estimated as between fifty and sixty thousand; and in connection with our inquiry laundresses and barmaids must also be taken into account.

Many of the women engaged in the manufacture of vests, trousers, and juvenile suits are the wives and daughters of the irregularly-employed and parasite population; they act as general hands in Jewish slop-shops; and, when they enter into competition with Jews, the grinding circumstances of their toil can hardly be conceived. 'Struggling wives and mothers of drunken husbands and starving children slave day and night for a pittance which even a "greener" would despise, except as apprenticeship to better things.'[1] Shirtmaking, not carried on in sweating dens, but far and wide in the homes of women, presents one of the hardest conditions of labour. As it requires little skill and no capital, married women undertake it to add to their husbands' irregular earnings, and so the unmarried women cannot compete with them in such work, because it does not yield the minimum of subsistence. If the commoner shirts sell at ten shillings a dozen, the sweater may get four shillings,

[1] *Labour and Life of the People*, p. 234.

Digitized by Google

but the worker only gets two shillings and three halfpence. Some of the worst cases reported by the Lords' Committee show that a week's work of this kind only realised from three to five shillings. Wages are incredibly low, because so many women are willing to take work at low rates, and to play into the sweater's hand by underselling one another. Fur-sewing presents another example of the evil caused by irregular work and low pay. For several months in the year the fur-sewers have either no work, or earn about three or four shillings a week, and many of these work in overcrowded, insanitary workshops during the season.

The lower grades of brushmakers and matchmakers do not get three shillings or two shillings and sixpence for a whole week's work, and cannot live on such earnings. Women are employed in the saddlery trade, and make pony bridles in their own homes. There are six buckles to sew on and fourteen pieces of leather to join; and twelve can be made in one day by hard work, for which one shilling is paid. Something of the nature of sweating exists in the weaving trade, in which forty per cent. of the workers are women, and they are known in the district of Bradford to work for sixty or seventy hours in a temperature varying from eighty to a hundred degrees, at a wage of two pence-halfpenny per hour. From evidence laid before the Royal Commission on Labour, we ascertain that in the rope and jute trades wages have gone down of late years, and work-people are compelled to work increased hours without any increase of pay. Only women are employed in the trade, and they suffer from chest complaints owing to the dust. The work is very heavy—too heavy, indeed, for men. Yet a great reduction of wages has taken place since 1887. For weaving sack looms they received then one shilling and sevenpence for 112 yards of material, now one shilling and a penny for making 134 yards. Formerly they got two shillings and fourpence for making 100 flour sacks, now they only get one shilling and sevenpence—that is, not one farthing a sack, which means also sewing the two sides and hemming the top. Employers show their books,

Digitized by Google

with twelve shillings or fourteen shillings against the name of a woman as her earnings, but she has had to help her in earning that amount three or four of her own children. Of all those who are broken on the wheel of competitive industry, no case is more distressing or melancholy than hers who has been left to mourn the premature death of the breadwinner—a young widow with a family of five or six children left to struggle as she best can for their support. If she died, too, the State would board out each child at four shillings a week, but it takes advantage of her maternal feeling, which prompts her to be sweated night and day that she may provide for her family. Women in that position have to enter thus handicapped into the fierce strife of the sweated industries, and they slave morning, noon, and night to get enough of food for the children, and often miserably fail to do so.

In the confectionery trade wages for women and girls ranged from five shillings to twelve shillings, few reaching the latter sum, while, disgusting to relate, the sanitary condition of the factories is said to be very bad. The girls have frequently to take their food in rooms where cocoanuts are crushed, and where decomposing refuse is kept. As for barmaids, those public-houses are counted good in which they do not work more than one hundred hours per week. They often live and sleep under extremely insanitary conditions, and it cannot be doubted that some employers directly promote immorality. Facts like those now adduced, and they could easily be multiplied, prove that the chief elements in the 'sweating' problem, such as sub-contract, irregular work, long hours, low wages, and insanitary conditions, press heavier on female industries than on the male. And it would not be difficult to produce evidence showing that other workers, such as omnibusmen, railwaymen, and shop assistants suffer from working excessive hours, and that many occupations, though not known as 'sweated industries,' have one or more of the same evils from which they suffer.

This brief statement gives us glimpses into a kind of under nether world of toil—a hideous, scandalous, almost infernal

Digitized by Google

state of things without inspection or organisation, where the brute-god Mammon reigns supreme—a world of outer darkness, where evil beasts creep forth, and the owls and bats of industrial chaos find a plentiful and easy prey; where the 'Mammon-gospel of Supply and Demand, Competition, *Laissez faire*, and Devil-take-the-Hindmost' is not much preached, but universally practised. It feeds the 'Submerged Tenth,' and though the 'Submerged Tenth' were lifted up it would pour fresh multitudes into the abyss. The 'Sweating System' grinds the faces of the poor in a way unknown to any other civilisation. They are not only trodden upon, but they are set to tread upon one another in the cruellest fashion. They underbid one another down to a penny an hour, and overbid each other up to fifteen hours a day. And all this exaction goes on under circumstances which prove the typical sweater of popular fancy and comic journalism to be very much of a myth. The public, alive to the evils, and anxious to vent their wrath on some victim, imagine some head of a large workshop to be a typical sweater, such as Kingsley sets forth in *Alton Locke*, and believes him to be an idler who grows rich by overtasking and beating down those whom he employs; but, on investigation, it turns out that in large and properly-appointed workshops the system of sweating is hardly, if at all, to be found. The men have good wages, regulated hours, and decent sanitary arrangements. Instead of being a monstrous human spider who lures hapless victims into his den and overworks them while he looks idly on, the sweating-master whom Charles Booth has found in connection with the troubles we are now investigating 'works hard, makes often but little more, and at times somewhat less, than his most skilled and best-paid hands.' The typical sweater is the immigrant Jew who, after being sweated for six months and getting a little assistance from the Jewish Board of Guardians, sets up as a small master and sweats the poor Gentile. He is quiet, sober, thrifty, able to live on little, willing to work hard for small pay, ready to undertake any kind of employment so as he can make a living—just the sort of worker that the old Political Economy sought to

Digitized by Google

encourage, the nearest approach to the ideal 'economic' man, the fittest to produce the largest amount of goods at the lowest cost of production. With all these virtues, he is void of social morality. 'No compunction or consideration for his fellow-workers will keep him from underselling or overreaching them; he acquires a thorough mastery of all the dishonourable tricks of trade which are difficult to restrain by law; the superior calculating intellect, which is a national heritage, is used unsparingly to enable him to take advantage of every weakness, folly, and vice of the society in which he lives.'[1]

Not only is the sweating-master such a hard-working and capable person, but small workshops, that constitute an important feature of the Sweating System, might be supposed to have a good effect in distributing the profits of industry among a greater number. It is the tendency of modern industrial forces to concentrate labour in great masses, to employ it in large factories, and thus enable a few employers to pile up enormous fortunes. Students of Economics have sometimes wished that the domestic industries of the last century had not been concentrated, but had been multiplied on the same original lines. Here, then, we find an arrest on the centripetal forces of the time, and a return to business conducted on a small scale in little workshops or private houses. Certain trades have gone back into the hands of home-workers, and what has been the result of this centrifugal movement? Several economic advantages have favoured the growth of the small-workshop system, such as the abundant supply of cheap unskilled labour, the avoidance of high rents for large business premises, the evasion of Factory Act restrictions, and other special conditions arising from these; but notwithstanding such advantages, and mainly on account of them, the multiplication of small workshops is regarded by careful observers as the tap-root of the 'Sweating System.'

A crowd of circumstances has gone to create this monstrous evil of the labour world. In the masses of cheap unskilled

[1] Hobson, *Problems of Poverty.*

Digitized by Google

work the multitude of small masters finds an opportunity for robbing the labourer of his hire. The excessive number of the unemployed has been aggravated in several ways. The tendency of the rural population to migrate into the towns has during the last three decades manifested itself so strongly as to assume the dimensions of a serious evil. An iniquitous land system has driven half the inhabitants of the countryside into the cities to carry on a fierce competition with workers already uncertain enough of steady employment there. What a picture does the author of *Labour and Life of the People* give us at the dock gates of London! 'There is a place called the cage, a sort of pen fenced off by iron railings. I have seen three hundred half-starved dockers crowded round this cage, when perhaps a ganger would appear wanting three hands, and the awful struggle of these three hundred famished wretches fighting for that opportunity to get two or three hours' work has left an impression upon me that can never be effaced. Why, I have actually seen them clambering over each other's backs to reach the coveted ticket; I have frequently seen men emerge bleeding and breathless, with their clothes pretty well torn off their backs.' Such a picture as that indicates the struggle that goes on wherever the normal supply of low-skilled town labour exceeds the demand, and in this glutted market there is a happy hunting-ground for the sweater who wants to get men at starvation rates. In addition, the acuteness of this condition is intensified by the influx of foreign labourers (especially Jews) into London, Liverpool, and other large towns; and these foreigners become most formidable competitors with our people in the lower grades of irregular and ill-paid work. Still further, women and girls, who do not depend on work for a living, but seek to add to the family income, or have a little pocket-money, enter the list of competitors, and thus help to drag down wages. Again, the isolation of workers in their own homes is another cause of miserable overwork and oppression. It facilitates an acute form of competition, by putting the workers very much into the hands of sub-contracting sweaters.

Digitized by Google

Sub-contract is not an essential feature of the system, for there are 'sweated industries' in which the method of sub-contract does not appear at all. But in the clothing trade, and women's work, which is largely home-work, sub-contracting agents give out the work, and are left to make their own terms and play off one set of hands against another. As the home-workers have no communication among themselves, and cannot meet to oppose any reduction of wages, the sub-contractor is virtually taskmaster, and they are his slaves.

There are firms of employers who deal directly with the workers, and may be said to sweat them by paying low wages and exacting long hours of toil. Wherever such employers are to be found, they are responsible for the degradation of the workers, even though it be possible to plead that the market rate of wages is given, and plenty of men and women can be got for this rate. But this advantage, due to the necessity of the poor, is not usually taken by employing firms; they are in the habit of fixing the hours of labour and paying higher wages in their workshops; and therefore it would be unfair to pillory the employers as a class, and pronounce them 'sweaters.' The 'Sweating System' has been regarded as mainly due to a craving for cheapness, and, if that be the case, then the blame must be laid on the purchaser, and the public must be viewed as the great 'sweater.' There can be no doubt that a criminal passion for cheapness exists among the working classes, and tends to complicate the industrial difficulties of our time. This popular demand for cheap things, fed by the commodities of the sweating trades, has reacted in such a way as now to be a powerful encouragement of the system. When one of the great export houses in Glasgow can send out ready-made dress shirts at sevenpence each, it shows the absolute ignorance or forgetfulness of the public in regard to the struggle which must have been undergone somewhere before any firm could export these goods at so low a price. It is deplorable that in a Christian community such a rage for cheap bargains exists, without a thought of the pittance at which they must have

Digitized by Google

been produced, and surely the Christian conscience ought to wake up in protest against the immorality and cruelty of the system. As a result of this desire for cheapness, there is turned out an enormous amount of inferior and trashy, scamped and botched work. The market is flooded with unsound wares —with cheap boots and slop-clothes that a few weeks' practice learns to make, and a few weeks' wear spoils completely; and it is the export of these sham articles that brings so much discredit on the good name of British industry in the different markets of the world.

A great many people think that such things must be—are inevitable under a law of competition, and try to palliate them by gifts of charity, but judge them from what point of view we choose they are to be condemned and ought to be done away with. Judged on religious grounds, they are insufferable. If we bear in mind the words of the prophet, we cannot defend such things. Overtasking has moral and spiritual aspects which men of keen insight like Amos and Isaiah did not overlook and were quick to reprobate. And the prophet who denounces exacting hours of labour is the prophet who insists in the same chapter on a faithful observance of the Sabbath—of a seventh day's pause, when the toils of men shall cease. 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable . . . then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth.' Men need the Sabbath as a day of rest, first of all to recover from their toil, and fit them again for their six days' work. The prophet who pled in his day for taking away the yoke urged the conclusion arrived at by an International Congress, held a short time ago in Paris, that an entire day of weekly rest is generally necessary for the health and vigour of body and mind of all labourers, and is an essential condition of general fitness for work and of prolonged life.

The Sabbath is to be kept as a day of rest, but to rest merely is to keep the Sabbath of the brute creation, and no more. It

Digitized by Google

is to be 'the holy of the Lord, honourable.' The soul of man must have time to dwell on heavenly things. How much better he is than an ox or a sheep! If he be exclusively occupied with the miserable arithmetic of making ends meet, he cannot admit the love of God or join in the worship of God, which is the very life of the soul. The Sabbath law is just and good, and should not be encroached on by any exactor of labour for the profits of unhallowed gain, or by any lazy lounger who spends the day in reading the Saturday's papers with the last football matches of all the countryside.

And He who came to fulfil the law and the prophets regarding excessive labour stood among the toilers, and said: 'Come unto Me, all ye that are *overtasked* and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' He fulfilled the very work of the prophets, and His own promise of rest in its highest sense, when He discovered the worth of the individual and asserted the right of every soul of man not to be degraded and oppressed by labour, but to be recognised as of infinitely more value than thousands of silver and gold. In the light of Christ, and the doctrines He teaches concerning the worth of the individual and the brotherhood of men, the terrible evils of the Sweating System stand forth condemned. It is this Gospel which should be preached not only to the poor but for the poor—the Gospel not only of the next world, as the land of rest, but of this—the Gospel by which the heavy burdens that oppress the poor shall be taken away.

Judged on economic grounds, the state of things we are dealing with is equally insufferable.

It is the aim of true Economics to elevate the Standard of Life, on the one hand by increasing the efficiency of the workers, increasing their energy, skill, and self-respect; on the other, by augmenting the remuneration of labour, and thus raising the standard of comfort. We are taught by the New Political Economy that man does not exist for the sake of material wealth, but material wealth exists for the sake of man; that labour is necessary to the development of human faculty,

Digitized by Google

but should not cause wear and tear of body or mind, and should aim at the highest standard of efficiency. In the light of such economic requirements, the evils of sweating are seen to be great social wrongs, detrimental to national well-being. Under this system, Labour is an unmitigated curse, an outrageous hardship, a thing to be utterly avoided, and not a blessing as it is meant to be. The conditions of overwork and low pay are hostile to the production of the most useful and valuable articles; there is a direct incentive to sham work. Instead of the fuller lives that make the highest gains to the nation, a low grade of workers is the result—a grade wanting in stamina alike of body and mind. Stunted and degraded lives in too vast numbers must be laid at the door of this system, and the fact of men and women being so overdriven and underfed will account for not a little of the drunkenness and immorality into which so many of this class are known to fall.

What are the remedies for removing this industrial anarchy, and bringing about a just and happy order? In trying to solve such a problem, we are often doomed to have our faith in panaceas shaken, and to see the clearest social sagacity outwitted. Hardly any means have been adopted to arrest the evils of sweating. The Lords' Committee on the subject has reported, and the Royal Commission on Labour affords fresh statistics in proof of terrible exactions. It is of the utmost necessity to rub the facts into the public mind and fix popular attention on the grievous state of affairs; for, by doing so, one form of exacting severity may be mitigated. If we can convince our bargain-hunters that bargains usually mean the oppression of poor men, and the sweating of widows and helpless girls, some check may be put on the mischief. If in running after cheap goods they had any idea or conscience as to whether the fair value of the goods was given, they might learn to let such goods severely alone. Everyone should keep his hands clean, and resolve to have no lot in gaining the cheapness of unpaid labour. Our Puritan forefathers would not use sugar made by

Digitized by Google

slave-labour, and had we the same conscience we could do something to put down sweating.

However, although the crave for cheapness could be nearly extirpated, this, with such an over-supply of low-skilled labour, would not be a complete solution of the problem; and, in view of the many unemployed who are competing with one another for bare subsistence, it has been proposed to deliver them from the tyranny of the 'Sweating System' by placing them in Labour Colonies or Public Workshops, where the strain of competition would not be so fatal to the workers. Such Labour Colonies in towns have been organised on a small scale in Germany, and rewarded with a fair degree of success; but the difficulty attending this plan of deliverance is, that, if it were to be carried out on a large scale, the labour of public workshops would enter into competition with private firms, so as to undersell them or bring down the price of articles by increasing the supply of produce beyond what the public requires. The question as to disposal of the labour in public workshops is one which advocates of this reform have not yet fully mastered, and one which must be clearly faced ere such a scheme could be put in practice. As it has been stated: 'If the State or Municipality were to undertake to produce work and wages for an indefinite number of men, who failed to obtain work in the competition market, the effect would be to offer a premium upon "unemployment." Thus, it would appear that as fast as the public works drew off the unemployed, so fast would men leave the low-paid, irregular occupations, and by placing themselves in a state of "unemployment" qualify for public service.' The establishment of a few, or even a large number of public workshops would be no deliverance, while their extension so as to include the whole of the unskilled workers would almost involve that socialistic policy which contemplates the nationalising or municipalising of all industry.

There is something more reasonable and likely in the proposal to check the excess of the labour-market by making

Digitized by Google

arrangements and multiplying inducements to keep the rural population attached to the soil. If the process could be reversed which carries people from country districts to London, Glasgow, or the nearest market towns, the large mass of labour would be spread over the land, and the body of workers in towns would not be hard pressed by a constant influx of competitors. The whole drift of things at present is from agriculture to manufacture, from the simple and healthy life of the country to the city with its insanitary conditions and its fierce struggle for existence. When that drift is changed, and men have some inducement to live in the country, as once they had, long hours of toil at starvation wages may cease to be the curse and shame of city life.

Many find hope for the sweated classes in the advancing demand for an Eight-Hours day of work.

The agitation for shorter hours is, without doubt, among the most important industrial movements of the close of the century, and however settled—by Statute, Trade Unionism, or the voluntary action of employers—it will be a potent factor in the elevation of the working classes. All are agreed that, with a view to the general welfare of the community, the hours of labour should allow workmen a reasonable amount of leisure for rest or recreation, for mental culture or the performance of social and serviceable offices. Everyone desires those who at present have long hours with low wages to receive at least those low wages for the short hours. Whether a law should be passed binding upon all labourers and restricting them to a working day of eight hours is a question which involves so many principles, moral and economic, that we are justified in keeping an open mind with reference to it. As to the economic result of reducing the hours, many hold that such a reduction would afford employment to a greater number of workers, and by relieving a congested labour-market contribute largely to abate the evils of sweating. If a shorter day were accompanied by an absolute prohibition of overtime, a larger body of workers would be required, and the standing pool of unemployed might

Digitized by Google

be dried up. In this way higher wages, as well as shorter hours, would be secured. Such a result is greatly to be desired and likely to be attained, however the problem may ripen to solution; but meanwhile there are economic difficulties to a shorter day, due to foreign competition with its longer day and lower remuneration, and as we must take care that the remedy is not worse than the cure, these difficulties must be met in a business-like fashion ere any shrinkage in the labour supply can take place, or the hopes of justice and humanity prevail.

We must turn our minds in other directions to find redress of an immediate kind for the wrongs of the overtasked, ill-conditioned, and poorly-paid workers.

The evils of sweating are mainly associated with industries that evade the legal responsibility of Factory inspection. Owing to this evasion, the worst evils of the system have been created. Abuses akin to those which existed in factories have been revealed in private houses, and power is needed to track out and destroy the sweaters' dens. Regulation of out-work is absolutely necessary, for the small uninspected workshops are the sweaters' dens, and these must either be abolished or put under strict control. Legislation has, in the Factory Acts, established a right to interfere in such matters as the hours of employment for women and children, overcrowding, and sanitary requisites. An extension of these Acts to home workshops is necessary to prevent overcrowding and insist on sanitation, and would likely have the effect of starving the tap-root of the disease. Such is the most thorough remedy proposed in the Report of the Lords' Committee, and the evidence of an expert given in that Report is held to be of great value: 'If the employers were compelled to obtain workshops, and the goods were made under a factory system, we believe that they could be made quite as cheaply under that system, with greater comfort to the workers, in shorter hours; and that the profits would be distributed among the workers, so that the public would obtain their goods at the same price.'

Digitized by Google

Legislative control would affect the sweating phases of overcrowding and unhealthy areas, but would not assist the low-skilled workers to obtain better wages and more regular employment; and therefore the advantages of combination must be sought to relieve the weakness of labour. Trade organisation must be added to restrictive legislation in any attempt to lift up those who sweat at the bottom of the industrial ladder. According to Howell, in his book on *Conflicts of Capital and Labour*, the primary object of Trade Unions includes all efforts to raise wages or prevent a reduction of wages, to diminish the hours of labour, or resist attempts to increase the working hours. Much has been done by the power of combination to elevate the worker in the higher grades, to produce what has been termed 'the aristocracy of labour'; and the same power must be brought to the assistance of the low-skilled worker. In the upper ranges of the Labour world they had no helping hand but their own, and not unfrequently they were handcuffed in the early struggles, but they went on working out their own salvation, feeling that if they were to stand erect it must be done by their own exertions. But how are the helpless and hard bestead toilers to be lifted up? At present, the unsweated classes, in the capacity of consumers, are gainers at the expense of the sweated, and humanity and justice alike plead that it should be the other way. It is reasonable to expect that certain advantages now held by the stronger at the expense of the weaker classes should be surrendered or won; and, if these advantages are to be won, it must be by the power of combination, and that put forth by others on their behalf. A splendid service of this description was performed by the leaders of the New Unionism in the case of the sweated dock gate men; and such services, if repeated all along the line of low-skilled labour, would be attended with the happiest results. Co-operation, in its several phases working among us, is also destined to play an important part in raising the moral and industrial condition of the sweated workers. There are different kinds of Co-operation at work, and others

Digitized by Google

which may be called into force, all of them seeking to abate the harsh stress of unbridled competition upon the poor. It may be that this remedy will not be effective until it assume the larger form of co-operative production on a national or municipal scale. At anyrate, the business of equalising the opportunities of citizens of all classes is the true keynote of progress in this country, and will furnish the new problems not only of the year 1892, but of the remaining years of this century.

By the aid of these three forces — Legislation, Trade Unionism, and Co-operation—can the poorest classes of Labour ever be helped out of their industrial weakness, rescued from overwork, and furnished with a fair opportunity of leading a decent life. In the spirit of citizens who are not indifferent to the growth of national wealth, but are still more in earnest for the growth of national welfare, we are bound to interest ourselves in the elevation of this part of the community, and to sympathise with all methods that are fitted to achieve the industrial salvation, and secure the personal dignity and independence of the poorest workers.

In closing our study of this painful problem, we should bear away with us some of the stimulus necessary to fire the public imagination and conscience respecting it.

One thing should we know, that work is noble and excellent. The idle man is unworthy of existence. As Carlyle says: 'All true work is sacred; in all true work, were it but true hand-labour, there is something of divineness. Labour, wide as the Earth, has its summit in Heaven. Sweat of the brow; and up from that to sweat of the brain, sweat of the heart; which includes all Kepler calculations, Newton meditations, all Sciences, all spoken Epics, all acted Heroisms, Martyrdoms,—up to that "Agony of bloody sweat," which all men have called divine!' The overtasking of men should never obscure the divine excellence of work.

A second thing to know is the light of Christ on the wages of work. His new doctrine is, 'The labourer is worthy of his

Digitized by Google

hire,' and His new commandment is, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Such utterances are coming to be recognised as the highest evolutions of economic truth, and their universal observance would render overdriving of the workers impossible, and win for them a just and generous remuneration of toil.

Another thing to bear in mind is that the sweated workers do not want charity, but simple justice and fairplay. Many Christian people think and say that such things as the sweating of the poor must be, are heaven-permitted, and try to alleviate the bitterness of the pinch by means of doles, soup tickets, and hospital notes. They do not realise that such a state of things is unjust, and ought therefore to be adjusted. What the oppressed workers ask is a fair opportunity to earn a decent livelihood—not to make injustice a little less cruel, but turn it into justice. Good Christians buy cheap articles, and glory over their bargains, wondering how they can be made for the price. Trace back the articles, and they have been made by poor, pallid, half-starved creatures, worked twelve or fifteen hours a day for ninepence or tenpence. Talk of charity! No wonder the hard-driven, shamefully-paid slaves cry with indignation: 'We do not want charity. Give us justice.'

Surely, in the face of these mal-adjustments, the Church should wake up to right the wrongs of our social state. The truth about these Social Questions requires honest study and dealing. The literary and mutual improvement societies connected with churches ought to acquaint themselves with the ethics and economics of social reform; new guilds might be started for the study of social interests in the light of Christ's moral teaching. A special new departure in Church life, by the adoption of such guilds, is urgently demanded by the times, and would lift the life of Christian membership to higher levels. Young men especially should join in this Forward Movement, and letting theory and practice go hand in hand should aid all upward social endeavours,

Digitized by Google

and thus convince a heedless world that they 'have understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do.' Let them take their places manfully on the side of justice and progress, and do their best to hasten that golden age for which we yearn.

Digitized by Google

XII.

CHILD LIFE AND RESCUE.

In the great ideal Commonwealths, from Plato's *Republic* down to More's *Utopia*, all the writers attach great importance to the institution and regulation of Family Life. For as the Family is so will the State be, and parents who train up a family well do work of inestimable value to the State. Plato, when setting forth his ideal Republic, puts on the lips of Socrates this counsel as to good teaching of children: 'You know also that the beginning is the chiefest part of any work, especially in a young and tender thing: for that is the time at which the character is formed, and most readily receives the desired impression.' Plutarch, writing four hundred years later, paints an ideal Commonwealth in his life of Lycurgus, and there gives minute instructions for the upbringing of youth. Parents were not at liberty to educate them as they pleased, but Lycurgus ordered them to be enrolled in companies, where they were all kept under the same order, and the whole of their education was calculated to make them subject to command, to endure labour, to fight and conquer. Spartan discipline was severer than Puritan ever dreamt of, and in both cases it turned out men of iron. Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia*, written when men's imaginations were kindled by the voyages of Columbus, represents the folly of an evil training: 'For if you suffer your people to be ill-educated, and their manners to be corrupted from their infancy, and then punish them for those crimes to

Digitized by Google

which their first education disposed them, what else is to be concluded from this but that you first make thieves and then punish them?' In the *City of the Sun*, Campanella, Bacon's contemporary, dwells on the importance of educating the young, and says: 'Therefore the breeding of children has reference to the commonwealth, and not to individuals. . . . And since individuals for the most part bring forth children wrongly and educate them wrongly, they consider that they remove destruction from the State, and therefore, for this reason, with most sacred fear, they commit the education of the children, who, as it were, are the element of the Republic, to the care of magistrates; for the safety of the community is not that of a few.' Such are the sentiments of noble-minded men who have dreamt of a Society that would be ideally perfect; and, however dubious we may be about their methods of reaching it, we cannot but agree with them when they point out that the true upbringing of children is the most important service which can be contributed to the greatness of any country. Most of us will allow that here 'home rule' is more to be desired than State interference, though the power of the State has gone far among us in the regulation of Child Life, and may have to interpose still more largely in the matter of Child Rescue. Among the primeval institutions of humanity none is so beautiful, or works so well for human good, as the Family with its diversity of sex, relation, temperament, taste, and pursuit. To unfold these varieties to their normal issue, not of assimilation or uniformity, but of harmonious co-operation and the good of all, is what blesses the State, and at the same time translates into human life our Gospel of Divine Fatherhood in Christ, 'from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.' The divine idea of Family Life, as realised to some extent, has been the glory of our land, the glory of the German Fatherland, and the glory of New England across the sea. Classical history tells us that while Greece and Rome retained a high estimate of the simple pieties of home, all went well with them: the glory of literature and the sovereignty of empire remained; but when the

Digitized by Google

Family fell from its proper place the glory departed. In our country the traditions of Family Life are still high and sacred among us; traditions of authority, reverence, love, and service that have made the Home a nursery for the Church and a training-ground for the nation. If the idea of the Family be degraded in any way, if the stock of that roof-tree show any signs of rot or decay, it augurs ill to every other social and public interest; and because such signs not only exist among us, but have actually borne fruit in anarchy and half the social distresses of our time, therefore all teachers, secular and sacred, are bound to consider and settle the problems connected with domestic life.

The problem before us is at once a question of prevention and of cure—an affair of Child Life and of Child Rescue. It is a far easier process to train the child than to reform the man; it is far easier to deal with material at the formative period, when it is plastic, soft, and susceptible to any influence that chooses to mould it—far easier than to deal with it at what may be termed a re-formative stage. How true this is in mind protoplasm, in soul building! At the first it is soft as wax to receive an impression, yet hard as marble to retain it, and this receptiveness of Child Life is what, humanly speaking, makes its opening years decisive of future good or ill.

But before we consider the nurture and moral upbuilding of this period, let us look on the children with kindly eyes, and think of the function they serve in our homes. In a sense more deeply true than many of us know, children train us up in the way we should go. Some one has said that this would be an inhuman world without the aged, and it would be a melancholy world without children. With their simple unsophisticated instincts, their open minds, and their responsive hearts, they show us the true secret of rejuvenescence, of renewing our youth like the eagles. Why does Scripture teach us that out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God builds a stronghold for weary men? Why did Christ Himself declare that things hid from the wise and prudent are revealed to babes—that conver-

Digitized by Google

sion, made so great a mystery by many of us, is just 'becoming like little children'! It was that which led Green, the historian, dying of overwork in a foreign land, to write among his last words: 'What seems to grow fairer to me as life goes by is the love and grace and tenderness of it—not its wit and cleverness and grandeur and knowledge, grand as knowledge is, but just the laughter of little children, the friendship of friends, and the cosy talk by the fireside, and the sight of flowers, and the sound of music.' Children are the flowers of our home gardens, their voices are the sounds of music we love to hear after leaving the hard traffic of the world; their simple spiritual instincts, sensitive to every pure and high emotion, responsive to every touch of generosity and affection, show us how to preserve a child-like spirit, and carry it into manhood and womanhood. They make sunshine in our homes, and with their fresh unworn lives serve to keep the old heart of the world young.

To foster and elicit, to train and renew, this Child Life, as it inevitably passes on to maturity and ripeness, is the sacred office of father and mother, the proper function of Home. The work of rearing little ones into men and women 'true in word and deed, brave, sober, temperate, and chaste,' is a work so invaluable that many qualities of head and heart are needed to do it well; but when we remember how plastic is the material a parent has to do with, he has only to bring ordinary dutifulness and diligence to the work that he may gain success, while the fresh, simple, and docile instincts of Child Life are so winsome and charming that he must be ineffably dull who does not draw them out with great delight. In the making of a child, certain conditions need to be borne in mind.

As childhood is almost wholly passive, under the influence to a great extent of whatever comes upon it from without, home surroundings have much to do in moulding it. The house in which it is reared, the locality in which the house stands, the healthiness or squalor of its daily lot, the pictures on its walls, the friends that visit, the sights and sounds of neighbourhood, —all these are educative influences that have begun to tell

Digitized by Google

before school days. If a child be reared in a slum dwelling, where pure air has no chance of entering, and the light is intercepted by dead walls and gable-ends, without any brightness inside or outside, it can only grow up a sickly, begrimed, and stunted specimen of its kind. In saying this, let us not forget that social environment may be as fatal to the moral making of a child when it is nursed amid numberless securities, comforts, and luxuries. The house may be expensively furnished, have plenty of rooms, plenty of food, everything to make it a home of elegance and ease. In the midst of these softening influences the child may grow up and fall as ready a prey to temptation as the child of a slum hovel. The temptation is not so coarse, yet the liability to it is as strong. It would be better for the child to have hardier and more rigorous surroundings in order to make a man of him. But take the surroundings of a 'Cottar's Saturday Night,' where the furniture is simple in its neatness, and the domestic circle is gathered into close companionship, where humble fireside comforts are not wanting, where the mornings are begun with prayer, and the long evenings are enlivened by juvenile games or baby on the knee,—there have you a thousand nameless influences that tell powerfully on the growth of Child Life, and go to shape its future for good.

The personality of the child should also be recognised as a factor of vital importance. God's works do not come from His hand like coins from the Mint, and this law of variety holds true in Family Life. Every human being has an original build, that makes him distinct from every other in physical feature, nor less so in mental cast and disposition and taste, and requires that he should be left to unfold in a new and original way. Nothing, however, is more frequently forgotten than this in training youth. There are parents and teachers who remind us of that mythical personage, who saw great inequalities in the lengths and shapes of men's bodies, and constructed a machine to stretch the short, and shorten the long, and mould them into proper patterns. Had that plan been universally adopted, there would have been none here to tell the tale. Too often the

Digitized by Google

Family institution is turned into such a Procrustes bed, and with fatal effect in crushing Child Life. A parent ought to study each of his children, know their individuality, and adapt himself to it. He ought to watch its opening, welcome it, and guard it with care, and guide it with loving perception and gliding tact. The child-nature is an open book, open as the light, but it begins to close with a quickness proportioned to its sensitiveness, whenever it is misunderstood. A parent can do much with it, immeasurably more than any other, but he will more readily mar than make it. What we often take for a sign of depravity in the child is but a proof of stupidity in the parent. We cannot make a child to order, and it would be a curious specimen if we tried. We cannot abrogate the law of personality. Therefore let the parent stand well aside, but only to appreciate with greater force the sacredness and delicacy of this feature out of which character is to be made.

It was a recognition of this elementary structure in the child which led men of the Illumination period in France to long for new ideals of Family Life—which led Condorcet to say: 'Education consists in such a discipline of the primitive impulses as shall lead men to do right, not by the constraint of mechanical, external sanctions, but by an instant, spontaneous, and almost inarticulate repugnance to cowardice, cruelty, apathy, self-indulgence, and the other great roots and centres of wrong-doing'—which led Vauvenargues to write: 'If instead of dulling the vivacity of children, people did their best to raise the impulsiveness and movement of their characters, what might we not expect from a fine natural temper?' A wise parent will seek to act along the line of the original disposition planted in each child from his birth, always remembering that it is, as it were, a necessity that each one should be, in some sort, different from every other. The Home is a little bit of flower-garden, where the flowers should grow in all their variety. We do not want them to be all roses, but we should look at them and say: 'Sweet flowers, bud and leaf and blossom as God made and wants you. Little daisy, keep your fringe, wee crimson tipt;

Digitized by Google

violet, open freely your velvet tufts; lily, rise up in your beauty on your graceful stem; rose, unfold your blushing charms.'

A third condition has to be remembered in Child Life, and that is the law of heredity. Much depends upon environment, on the atmosphere round the child continually. It is true that the child will be as the parent is, as what the ordinary conversation of the household at meal times, and in evening hours, tends to be; but at the same time something has been derived by the parent and transmitted to the child, before home surroundings have any effect. The child nature is determined, prior to the action of will and the influence of environment, by tendencies bound up in its organisation, and conveyed to it through family, people, and race. There is an element of sin in human nature apart from that of the individual will, there are predispositions to evil that show themselves in the first movements of childhood. Is infancy perfectly pure or truthful or honest, even when nurtured around a blameless domestic hearth? Let us listen to history, or to the testimony of wise and good parents, and they have but one sad answer to give. Some systems of teaching make too much of this dark element that has mingled with the innermost tissues of our being, but no parent can ignore it, and should only find in its existence a call to greater watchfulness and solicitude in the proper treatment of Child Life. If he finds it wise to respect the personality of the child, and stand aside to let it have free play, he must also take account of hereditary inclination to any evil, and step forward to nip it in the bud, lest, by his neglect and the power of habit, it should spring up to embitter the whole life. It may be expedient at this point to speak of what is needed by parents in the direction and management of a family. Qualifications of heart and brain are wanted for this work as almost for no other. Long apprenticeships are served for much less difficult and delicate employments, and yet it is to be feared that men and women assume responsibilities of this kind without much fitness for discharging them. Many of us are disqualified, and all of us are underqualified, to do the duty

Digitized by Google

required of us in the family circle; yet if parents are willing to show a reasonable diligence in this business, they may acquire the proper equipment, and not fail of their end.

Taking for granted the instinctive force of natural affection, it may be said that no better equipment for the parental office is known than what was divinely attributed to the patriarch: 'For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment.' It is a parent's office to command, to govern, to control; to exercise authority, to administer discipline. He is called, in the little kingdom of Home, to execute the office of a king. As it is his right to command, so it is the duty of the child to obey. The ends for which the Family exists are defeated, if authority is not exercised on one side, and if obedience is not conceded on the other. Nothing, indeed, should be commanded but what is just and reasonable, and then obedience is fitting and right. Nor should the tone of command be harsh and dictatorial. A stormy voice, a violent emphasis, a menacing air, only weakens authority. Command, if firm but calm, and having right in itself, uniformly wins reverence and submission. The rod, so often counselled in Scripture, must mean something, but not necessarily a rod of iron or even a rod of wood. An old editor of John Bunyan quaintly observes: 'After bringing up a very large family, who are a blessing to their parents, I have yet to learn what part of the human body was created to be beaten.' If occasional correction be thought necessary, there should be a look of tender reluctance in administering it. When the child thinks of his father as a confidant, then authority will be absolute; the father's lips will be an oracle, and his lightest wish a law.

In addition to authority, there must be example. Of the model parent it is said, 'He will command his children *after him.*' Example and precept are to be conjoined, where family training attains success. True fitness for this work lies in a consistent upright walk and conversation. When authority is

Digitized by Google

enforced by character, the child not only learns to submit but to imitate. For children are keen critics and quick observers, always putting parents on trial, and nothing can be more disastrous than parental inconsistency to the simple, trustful soul of a little child.

At every stage, however, of Child Life, the prime qualification is to be able and willing to watch its development with a quiet, patient vigilance, and to surround it with an atmosphere of tender sympathy, intercession, and love. No loftier duty on earth, no more awful talent, no more precious opportunity, can be found than that wherewith we undertake to nurture and train a little one in the way wherein he should go. The parents' part in such an office is supreme and unspeakably important. What will the child be? In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred what the parents make it. Practically, no one else can share that solemn responsibility.

Come, then, and stand at the cradle of a new-born child—place most solemn in all the wide world. It is the gate of life, the formative period of mind and heart, conscience and will, during the first three years of which a parent does more than half of what he can ever do again for his child. Plato indicates somewhere that more is done, or lost by neglect of doing, on character in the first three years than in all the years of discipline afterwards. In the first two years, the child nature is plastic, and nothing else; every day, every hour, registers impressions that will abide as long as that nature lasts. At this stage, the mother is the first educator, with an indefinite power of making the child; no other is so absolutely the creator of character. In the third year of childhood, the development of language and moral ideas has begun, and, humanly speaking, the rest of life hangs now and for ever on the method of nurture for the next two or three years. Every father and mother should understand that their duty to the child now begins in true earnest. Bend over the little one with tender interest, watching the dawn of mind, and leading it out. Watch for the first smile, and welcome it as the sweet twilight of reason and

Digitized by Google

affection. Mark the growth of intelligence on the listening ear, the brightening eye, and the questioning gaze, and add to the nurture of loving looks and tones the use of speech in developing the child mind. From the first we have the simplicity, the trustfulness, and the obedience of children, as a characteristic part of the early day, and all that is the element in which mental growth should proceed apace. In teaching them to think, it is not necessary to crush their emotional nature and drill them after the severe fashion to which John Stuart Mill was subjected as a child by his father; but to get them to think, to think accurately, and as the understanding opens, to think how it is best to live—such is the very essence of all true education, and it cannot begin too early, nor should it ever end. The whole teaching of the greatest German of this century has been cited in his own words, *Gedenke zu leben*, and Goethe's words have been translated by Carlyle, 'Think of living.' It is the psalmist's lesson to a young man, that he should take heed to, or think about, the cleansing of his way. The child should as early as possible be taught to think, and to think for himself, that he may not grow up thoughtless and inconsiderate, acting on the mere impulse of the moment, but may set a high, clear aim before him in life, and keep that aim steadfastly to the end. Nothing good was ever yet done without thought, and till the young begin to *think of living*, to consider how they may find and keep a clear, right, and upward path, they will through life flounder in the mire. Another important element of training for children in the use of their minds is that of directing them how to observe. It is not a power which needs cultivating so much as guiding. For in childhood the observative faculty has a phenomenal keenness, but there is a danger lest it should degenerate into something mean or trifling. Observation has a thousand books of study, which a man passes without reading just for the want of an eye to see or an ear to hear. There is a well-known story called 'Eyes and No-eyes,' which describes how two boys took the same walk across the heath, up the hill, and home by the

Digitized by Google

river-side; and while one noticed nothing, the other saw all manner of wonderful things—the mistletoe growing on the crab-tree, the woodpecker running up a trunk, a water-rat plunging into its hole, a kingfisher shooting past him like a flash of light, a lark soaring high above his head—and other marvels we have not time to recount. A child is only half-educated, though he have all the classics at his finger-ends, if he has not been taught to use this observant capacity, by the use of which instruction and pleasure may be derived from every walk we take. If we are alert, quick to see, and diligent to learn, we may come to know the ferns and wild-flowers in field and copse, and to distinguish the plumage and songs and habits of the commonest birds, and thus find the world growing full of beauty and of music as we pass through it.

As Child Life advances, the instinct of obedience, spontaneous and easy at first, comes to be tried by the lust of the flesh, by the craving of appetite, by the influence of companions, and then no lesson needs so much to be learned as that of self-rule. If children are not kept well in hand, but are allowed to indulge their appetites, they are sure to ruin themselves in health and reputation, in body and soul. Do not most men spend the first half of their lives in forming habits which need the latter half to break them off? Such wastes of life can only be prevented by that wise discipline which teaches children that there are other and better things than gratifications of the flesh, however imperative, and even natural, the cravings may be. It is of the greatest moment to restrain them with such a sweet reasonableness, yet with such firmness, that they may come to be masters of themselves, and not be misled by the rough-and-tumble experiences of the playground or the evil companionships of the world.

But the highest and best influences to which Child Life from the first should be amenable are those of religion, and the religion ought to be of such a kind as to act by no compulsion, assume no look of sourness, and impose no yoke of bondage,

Digitized by Google

but ought to pour into the heart of childhood like sunshine, and surround it with an atmosphere of freedom, purity, and love. To young people religion has too often been made a bugbear and a terror, instead of being presented as the source of truest and most enduring delight. Parents should teach the little ones that God is their Father in heaven, who sent His Son to take our sins and sorrows upon Him, and give Himself for us —who ever sends the Spirit of His Son to move the youngest by all the happy thoughts and kindly impulses astir within, coming whether from the fair natural world, or the sacred affections of home, or the wisdom of friends, or the lessons of the sanctuary. A religion like these for its inner verities exhibits to childlike minds the fairest forms, and bids them follow after 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely and of good report.'

What are the aids by which Child Life, in its mental and spiritual advance, may be normally and symmetrically unfolded? How shall parents and teachers best conduct this educative work? First, as a process of mind there is a child literature marvellously adapted to this end. Stories are the imaginative food of childhood, and perhaps the recognition of this kind of teaching among us is not as frank and full as it might be. In our somewhat one-sided and stern theories of education we have kept the imagination prisoner, and in our anxiety to see them grave and well behaved we make them tame and dull. It needs to be remembered that the imaginative faculty is vivid in children, and should not only be trained but used as an instrument for training all the other powers. In the *Republic*, Plato says: 'Come, then, and like story-tellers, let us be at leisure, and our story shall be the education of our heroes. . . . You know that we begin by telling children stories which, though not wholly destitute of truth, are in the main fictitious. . . . Shall we carelessly allow children to hear any casual tales, and receive into their minds notions which are the very opposite of those which are to be held by them when they grow up? We cannot allow that. Then the first thing

Digitized by Google

will be to have a censorship of the writers of fiction, and let the censor receive any tale of fiction which is good, and reject the bad; and we will desire mothers and nurses to tell their children the authorised ones only. Let them fashion the mind with these tales.' Never was a censorship of this kind more necessary than now to discard the multitude of stories that are written for children, and the multitudes of novelettes that corrupt the minds and morals of youth. Happily time exercises such a censorship, and leaves a sufficient number of stories adapted to the susceptibilities of children and fitted to be of use in moral upbuilding. Old myths furnish good stories when viewed as symbols of moral conflict, when the struggle between man and brute becomes the struggle between good and evil. Hercules, for example, kills the Nemean lion, and ever after wears a helmet of lion's hide—teaching with a vividness which at once impresses a child that every man's great adversary lies in wait for him somewhere, and that all future victory depends on slaying it. Ruskin and Lewis Morris have shown what wealth of instruction lies in those myths of the past, while the richest treatment of them is given by a master in tales for children, by Hawthorne, whose *Wonder Book* and *Tanglewood Tales* should be in every nursery library. The folk lore provides many books of fairy tales. It is the oldest literature in the world—as old and widespread as the Aryan family—contains the earlier echoes of the youth of our race, and gives glimpses into the ideal world of childhood. There is no school in Fairyland, nobody is ill, and doctors' drugs are unknown. But the struggle between innocence and malice, between honesty and its opposite, between intelligence and brute force, presents the simple moral elements which give children so vivid an interest in these tales. Transparent justice holds everywhere in Fairyland, and because it is not foisted as the moral, or even hinted at as such, children do not fight shy of it, while their elementary sense of justice is strengthened all the while. Dainty little volumes can easily be obtained with groups of stories from the *Arabian Nights*—those tales of the one thousand and one nights

Digitized by Google

illustrating various phases of Eastern romance. Anyone who recalls the impression they made when first read will recognise what an educative value they have for childhood, opening out to it the greatness and marvel of the universe, and carrying to wide horizons the boundaries of research. Those kings who go about in disguise to detect abuses; those caskets fished up from the sea with genii inside; those lamps which show the vaults where lies hidden treasure; those giant-birds that carry diamond-seekers into inaccessible valleys; and ten thousand novelties of experience, give the *Arabian Nights* a unique place in the higher education of a child, carrying him into recesses and vistas, enchantments and splendours, that quicken thought and suggest untold possibilities of life. Such a story as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* charms the young mind, because it is told in such a way as to leave a good half to be filled up by imagination. The story of *Robinson Crusoe* is a perennial delight to children, not only for the story but for the details of unexpected events, scraps of natural history, and lessons of inventiveness got in the midst of difficulties. Other books for children written in our day, such as those of Hans Andersen with their daintiness and final happy touch, Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* and *Alice through the Looking-Glass*, Charles Kingsley's *Water Babies*, George MacDonald's *Back of the North Wind*, Mrs. Molesworth's *Carrots*, *Just a Little Boy*, Burnett's *Little Lord Fauntleroy*,—all of them swim in an air of most real Child Life; but we must be content with simply mentioning them, in order to point out that the perfection of story-telling is to be found in the Bible, and that some of the greatest and most character-making stories of the past are those which it relates, which are no mere fictions, but true accounts of heroes who lived and struggled amid the dire facts of life. The famous old stories about Noah, Joseph, Moses, David, Daniel, and Esther, have thrilled the child heart in every age, and will do so to the end of time.

As to religious aids, the most important thing to be considered is the relation of children to the Christian Church—

Digitized by Google

to its ordinances and appointed means of grace, such as the Bible, Prayer, Sacraments, Christian precept and example. The organic influence of the Family and the Church in the religious education of the young must be viewed as supreme, and to them we must look as the two main factors in carrying out the Bible injunction: 'Train up the children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' If the Church and the Family understood such organic influences, and took full advantage of them, not only would a godly seed grow up, and spread forth, but there would be less need, if any need at all, to press for the authorised teaching of religion in public schools. However strong be our conviction that religion is necessary to nations as well as to individuals, and lies at the very foundation of social order, men have come to understand that compulsory religious teaching is abhorrent to all rational principles of liberty of conscience, and they feel that instruction in different creeds acknowledges that one religion is as good as another. It is true that a severe exclusion of religious themes from schools might amount to the teaching of atheism, and instead of entire secularisation we may look for a final solution of this question in teaching the elements of religion which underlie all creeds and belong to religious unity.

Such a chaotic state of things only serves to emphasise the duty of the Church in relation to the Family, for its chief and most hopeful openings are to be found there. By one memorable word Christ claimed the children as His beloved property, when He said, 'Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' In the strength of that claim, the Church enters the Family with the sacrament of baptism for the consecration of Child Life—with the instruction that the little one should be surrounded by an atmosphere of piety at home, and have it inwrought into character, and so have the child manifestly sanctified and sealed from its birth to a Christian life. 'It is the very idea of infant baptism . . . that the child born in a Christian family is, when all things are as they should be, to have this advantage

Digitized by Google

over others, that he does not come to Christianity out of heathenism, or out of the consciously sinful, natural life, but, from the first dawning of consciousness, unfolds his powers under the imperceptible, *preventing* influences of a sanctifying religion.' By proper Christian training, character in children gets the start of sin by a kind of gracious anticipation. Childhood ought in this way to be nurtured in piety, till in answer to the consecrations and prayers and educating methods of the Church, the Holy Spirit shall sanctify a generation of children, like the youthful Samuel and Timothy, from a time so early as to leave no traces of resisting His blessed influences. The natural and easy way for a child, one says, is to grow up a Christian, so as never to remember the time when he was not one. 'Every family,' says Jonathan Edwards, 'ought to be, as it were, a little Church, consecrated to Christ, and wholly influenced and governed by His rules. And family education and order are designed of God to be, and are, some of the chief means of grace; and if these fail, all other means are likely to prove ineffectual.' The Church has still another duty in the Christian home, that of enjoining parents to watch for the first traces of right feeling and purpose in the young, and bring them to the other sacrament, to the Lord's Supper, just as soon as it is seen that they clearly understand and truly feel its meaning. The children of Jewish households partook of the Passover in the old dispensation, and the children of Christian parents should as early be brought to the Lord's Table, as soon as the working of God's Spirit seals them for Himself. It is a great practical error, in the religious training of youth, to put far off into the future this sacramental vow of allegiance to the Saviour; for it leaves the young to worldly thoughts and feelings and influences, and instead of sacredly holding them for Christ they are allowed to go forth out of the old home into the world without this anchorage, and, consequently, they drift through life with a hazy notion that by and by, in some revival or other awakening, they may be brought out on the Lord's side. A great amount of leakage occurs in this way,

Digitized by Google

and so serious has it become that, if not stopped, the Church will die a lingering death; but let the Church proceed by growth from within through its normal and ordinary means of nurture, and it will be blessed with steady and permanent enlargement. The true doctrine of Christian ingathering is the salvation of childhood—the folding of all the lambs of the flocks under the Good Shepherd's care. As we bring our children to the closet and the family altar and the reading of the Bible, and the Sunday School and the House of God and the Lord's Table, might we not expect that multitudes—so many as to form the rule and not the exception—would, from their earliest years, be found growing up into the Christian life? More advantage ought to be taken of the children's relation to the covenant of promise, and more heed given to the organic forces of the Church in Christian households.

From all that has been said we learn that, however many aids may be at work, the chief factor in making men and women, in building up a true society, is to be found in the Family. After the Church and School, after pastors and teachers have done all in their power, there must be a little Church and School at every Christian fireside; and it should be our highest aim, as it will be our greatest success, to secure that state of things in the households of our people. Let there be a home fit for the training of good men and women. It need not be a rich home, nor even a comfortable home, to make it a Christian home. If it be only a garret, Christ and true goodness might still be there. Let us emphatically deny that wealth or position is needed to make a fit home. If we teach our children well, and form in them, by methods that are silent and constant, a spirit of duty to God and man, they will be fit for everything—fit for any trust in life, fit for any society, and, best of all, fit for heaven.

In dealing with children, the problem is twofold—preventive and curative, formative and reformative. There is a submerged tenth of child, no less than of adult, life. It is desirable to find a way out of Darkest England, but it is better still to stop the

Digitized by Google

way in; and if home life had been pure and worthy in every case, there had been no need to speak of reform in our child population. On account of parental neglect and unfaithfulness, myriads of children are growing up in the way they should not go; on account of the calamities of Providence, multitudes of little ones are without father, the homeless and destitute waifs and strays, whose wan cheeks are wet with tears of sorrow, and in whose eyes has never sparkled the light of childlike innocence; on account of the vice or cruelty of parents, crowds of boys and girls may be described as 'orphans whose misfortune it is to have a father and mother'; on account of economic mal-adjustment, swarms of gutter children appear every year in our large cities as street arabs, afterwards to become tramps, criminals, or casual labourers, incapable of strong and continuous work. These orphan or neglected or oppressed children are huddled into miserable dens, where morality or happiness is impossible, where unhealthy conditions lead to vast infantile mortality; and yet, though the death-rate of slum children is high, the birth-rate in slums is far higher than in respectable neighbourhoods. Take a family visited by the writer in a provincial town, consisting of a mother and four children, and living in a squalid hovel. The mother, about thirty-eight years of age, was married at seventeen, and had given birth to six children. Three of them had a pallid sickly appearance; one child, bare-footed, sat with his legs almost stuck into the bars of the fireplace to catch a little heat; the youngest, two years old, was evidently half-starved. They were left to themselves all day, while the mother professed to be out foraging for them somewhere. One of them was at school, and looked healthier than the rest, because he was less confined to the dark and foul surroundings of home. They were living without any Church connection or religious influence. How children in such a state will grow up, and what will be their after-life, it is not hard to guess. After a year or two at school, they stay as little as they can in their filthy dwellings, but run about the streets at will day and night, picking up an uncertain livelihood, and often expected by

Digitized by Google

drunken or idle parents to get as much by begging, or stealing, as will provide the night's supper and bed. Benjamin Waugh estimates that out of seventy-eight or eighty thousand London children that leave school every year, one-half follow no regular trade, but take themselves to the precarious livings of the streets until they 'hob-job' into gaols or reformatories.

What is to be done with this great mass of infancy and childhood, utterly helpless, inevitably sinking into pauperism, vice, and crime, if left to itself? We cannot let it alone, because it will not let us alone. We cannot, as Ann Taylor, in *Original Poems for Infant Minds*, did nearly a century ago, tell 'little Charlie' to come in from the tempest and snow, and propose to close the shutters and pile fresh faggots on the fire, while we, thankful to God for such comforts, leave the orphan and poor with

> 'No house for their shelter, no victuals to eat,
> No bed for their limbs to repose;
> Or a crust, dry and mouldy, the best of their meat,
> And their pillow a pillow of snows.'

We cannot retreat into our snug homes, and leave the neglected and wronged little ones to their outcast lot. If we do not make headway against these evil conditions they will make headway against us; the neglects of many generations may recoil on us and our families. We must undertake the task of rescuing, shielding, and training this necessitous child-population, or run the risk of social anarchy in the future. There is not much hope of dealing with adult vagabond life, but if the children are taken young enough, so as to be placed in a completely new environment, or subjected to a well-ordered and disciplined life; if such influences be continued to them until they arrive at an age when their own character is formed and developed, then may we hope to dry up the thousand tributaries which feed this torrent of social wreckage in our land. Let us save the wastrel children, and we shall solve the problem of the poor for the next generation. On God's earth there is not an

Digitized by Google

enterprise more Christ-like, or a mission more hopeful, than that which seeks to rescue destitute children from that fate of unspeakable peril and lifelong misery which lies before them. Attempts to shield, to help, and save from those worst ills of life should be made at two critical periods—one from six to twelve, and the other from twelve to sixteen. In the first period, the children of the slums begin to prowl about the streets and get initiated into the arts of vice and crime; and in the second period, they acquire habits of indolence, which, if not prevented by the formation of industrious habits, make them loafers for life.

The problem before us, then, in Child Rescue is how we can turn into a productive and valuable commodity that which is now a wasteful and noxious element in our social system. Much to the credit of Christian philanthropy in our day, that problem has been dealt with in ways as wise and tender as they have been practical and fruitful of good. Thirty years ago there were no charitable institutions to afford a shelter or home for unfortunate little fellows under ten years of age and in danger of falling into crime. As good Ann Taylor puts it in her song of *Winter*, they were left out in the cold. It was precisely for such small members of the community that home and school ought to have been provided at the very first. Now that necessity is recognised, and it has been attended to on so large a scale that we can hardly enumerate the agencies which exist to shield and save the little ones, and equip them for the work and battle of life. Societies are to be found among us for the prevention of cruelty to children, for thousands of little ones are bruised and scarred, or left to starve; their homes have been no homes, but the 'habitations of cruelty.' Indeed, it has been necessary to pass statutes of the realm for the purpose of visiting the sins of the parents upon themselves, to the advantage of the children. Though 'wilful' cruelty or neglect is not always easy to prove, it is sad to know that cases may be discovered, not only in large cities, but in country towns. Some of the noblest efforts at Child Rescue are

Digitized by Google

those to be witnessed in Müller's, Barnardo's, and Quarrier's Homes. Other institutions might be enumerated, such as Ragged Schools, Spurgeon's Stockwell Orphanage, Shoe-Black Brigades, National Refuges for Homeless and Destitute Children, and their working is well worthy of being studied. But if we note two of these institutions—that of Dr. Barnardo representing England and that of William Quarrier representing Scotland—we shall learn what can be done, and should be far more widely done, for the little ones. Barnardo's Homes have been twenty-five years in existence, and during that time 17,122 boys and girls have been rescued, trained, and placed out in life. During last year, between 6000 and 7000 cases of destitution have been relieved; 98,400 free meals given to children and to the homeless poor; about 5000 boys and girls actually maintained in the Homes, and 300 sent to the colonies. The Homes include forty-one separate branches, thirty-three of which are in London, and so grouped as to meet child destitution in almost every phase, from the very cradle to the threshold of adult age. The only qualification of admittance is when any instance can be shown to be more destitute than others. The objects aimed at are to rescue, educate, industrially train, and place out in life, orphan and destitute children. There is a Babies' Castle that has sheltered 2000 during a quarter of a century, a Nursery Home for very little boys of five years in Jersey, who are transferred at the age of ten to Leopold House in Burdett Road, where all of them between ten and thirteen devote their whole time to education. There is a Village Home for orphan and destitute girls in Essex, in which 897 rescued girls were resident at the close of 1890. Each cottage shelters from sixteen to twenty-five girls, with a Christian lady, called 'Mother,' at the head of each family. The girls attend school daily, and are carefully trained in domestic service; and after completing this education they proceed to Canada or go out as domestic servants in this country. At Stepney Causeway Home the boys are trained on the 'half-time system,' spending a portion of their time in

Digitized by Google

school and what remains in the workshop, where they may learn one or other of a dozen trades. This training in some technical handicraft is a principal feature of these Homes. What General Booth proposes to do, Dr. Barnardo has done for years—he has been turning out bakers, blacksmiths, brush-makers, carpenters, harnessmakers, matmakers, printers, shoe-makers, tailors, tinsmiths, wheelwrights, and woodchoppers. He has an industrial village already in full work, and proposes a new scheme of colonisation, which has been approved by the Minister of Agriculture in Canada. The Canadian Government is prepared to give every settler eighteen years old a free homestead of 160 acres, and a number of these sections will be carefully selected from year to year near the Industrial Farm in Manitoba, and lads of several years' standing in the Homes will be selected and sent out to such homesteads. Further details of a strictly business character need not be stated. If thousands of children have already been picked up from the gutter by such strenuous philanthropy, and placed in positions of self-support and self-respect, it is a simple acting out of the same spirit to attempt greater things still; and happy is the man who undertakes a work so God-like as this! Dr. Barnardo tells us that, with his methods already proved successes, it would be as easy to rescue 40,000 as 4000 children, and he would gladly undertake to clear the streets entirely of the miserable waifs who now fester in our slums, and breed despair for future generations. He has the experience, the machinery, and the agents, and all that remains is—the funds necessary to meet expenses. He is doing the Nation's Work, as one man in a million can only do it, and the Nation's Purse does not contribute to the cost. Quarrier's Homes have been twenty years doing a like work for the destitute children of Glasgow and the North. Orphan and fatherless boys and girls from one to fourteen years, and destitute lads and young women from fourteen to eighteen, are received without subscriber's line, on simple proof of destitution. In Glasgow there are City Orphan and Working Boys' Homes, Children's

Digitized by Google

Night Refuge, and Young Women's Shelter, while at Bridge-of-Weir there are Bethesda and Elim Houses for incurable orphan children, Ship on Land to train boys to be missionary seamen, and Training Homes for boys and girls for Canada. About 500 are admitted every year, and a total of 1200 pass through the Homes during the same time. In the country Cottage Homes the value of the Family system is very fully recognised. The old Barrack system of congregating children in large numbers is discouraged. It is found to be a more excellent plan so to locate them that they feel the cottage to be their Home, under the care of a Christian man and his wife. Such a surrounding is needed for outcast and destitute boys, who never had right home training, and have hitherto been reared amid scenes of vice. This idea has now taken hold of the public mind, and has been improved upon to the extent of placing children of all ages in each house; and when a baby is admitted the amount of petting he gets would spoil a bigger boy. Quarrier sends out from his Homes successive bands of children to Canada, sometimes as many as 250 in the year, and they are eagerly welcomed by farmers in Ontario, while some of the older boys go to try their fortunes in the Great North-West. In a *Narrative of Facts*, relative to work done for Christ in connection with these Homes—a closely-packed record of one hundred pages—such entries as this constantly recur: 'During the past week many sad cases of destitution have been brought before us, and it has been our privilege to afford relief to quite a number of these. A boy of eleven from Aberdeen, one of five from Dumbarton, a little girl of two from Dunfermline, a lad of seventeen, and three girls of seventeen, nine, and two from Glasgow, have been taken in.'

In this short survey of Child Rescue it is evident that, as compared with the need, we are only at the beginning of the work, and that it ought to be indefinitely extended. If we were alive to social wants, and had the power of initiative, there should be an extension of this Cottage Home system into

Digitized by Google

every town where these waifs and strays of our population are to be seen in their rags and misery. Now that the leading principles for solving this part of the child-problem have been wrought out in a few splendid institutions, they ought to be adopted more widely. Such Homes as Müller and Spurgeon, Barnardo and Quarrier have founded, besides opening their doors to little children and giving them home influences as nearly as possible have also solved the difficulty of uniting elementary, technical, and we might add religious, education. Nothing remains but for Christian philanthropy to introduce into every parish of the land a well-tried method which would at once remove every neglected child from destitution and danger to a healthy school and home. There is a difficulty in working these Orphan Homes, and on the other hand there is an advantage connected with them, to both of which a passing reference is necessary.

In prosecuting these labours of love, much embarrassment is caused by drunken or worthless parents claiming children who have been rescued from their cruel treatment or gross neglect, and set once more on the way of a useful life. Only think of it! Here is a child neglected by a drunken mother till he is starved to the lowest ebb of life; he has been picked up, and safely sheltered from temptation, and now he has a chance for life, but his drunken mother demands him as soon as he can earn or beg a penny, and thus pander to her base appetite. She has only to clamour for his recovery, and the law says it must be so. But a law more imperative still says that any parent who puts on others the charge of maintaining his children morally forfeits the right of determining their career, and that in the case of persons of infamous character they should, for the children's sake and for society's sake, be deprived of parental rights at once and altogether. A law of this kind, duly safeguarding true parental claims, should be passed by the State, in order to preserve rescued children from the nefarious designs of unnatural parents.

On the other hand, the technical training in handicrafts

Digitized by Google

which obtains in these Homes might with advantage be extended to all the destitute children of the land in connection with our system of national education. What is given to the few in private institutions, and as a premium for juvenile neglect or delinquency, should be given to the whole of our youthful population. Much can be said in favour of this training of the hands as well as the training of the head. Never shall we get rid of a loafing and shiftless proletariat so long as the children grow up without learning a regular trade. It gives them a chance to be wage-earners, and reach a self-reliant life. The training of the head without the training of the hands may only fit them to read that vile rubbish which circulates in the slums, and depraves them beyond hope of leading wholesome and useful lives. 'There are forty "Penny Dreadfuls" issued weekly in the metropolis, having in all a circulation of a million, and these are read almost exclusively by children.'[1] Our Board School system is admirable in many ways, but it would be more admirable still if it supplemented elementary by technical education in connection with various trades, and thus imparted, between twelve and sixteen, a habit of steady useful industry, by which young people could turn their hands to some kind of employment and gain an honest living.

Another question, cognate to this part of our subject, is concerned with the provision of dinners to children attending elementary schools. There is hardly a more pathetic sight than a class of poor children at school with thin pale faces, for many of them have had no breakfast. At once compassion prompts us to feed the hungry, and public well-being dictates that the physical basis should be healthy and strong in order to mental training. But some argue that such free feeding of poor children is an allowance to the parents, which may, as the history of the Poor Law shows, tend to depress wages, sap the sense of responsibility in family life, or encourage parents to spend the more on self-indulgence. Doubtless, such a view of possible

[1] Samuel Smith, M.P.

Digitized by Google

danger must be kept in mind, but our best instincts, under wise direction, ought always to be followed, and they tell us to mitigate as far as possible the law of nature that children must suffer for their parents, and to bear in mind the divine law of charity that the hungry should, at anyrate, have something to eat; while common sense teaches that half-starved children cannot properly assimilate instruction, and 'why spoil the ship to save a ha'porth of tar?'

It is only a small part of the great family of needy and suffering children that obtains the benefits of these institutions; it is only the tens and twenties that find shelter and food and training there, but what about the hundreds and thousands that run at large upon our streets? Is there no institution to care as well for the soul as the body of these hapless, hopeless children? Yes, the Christian Church has this for a part of its grandest work on earth. 'Lovest thou Me?' says the risen Lord;—'feed My sheep.' 'Lovest thou Me more than these?—feed My lambs.' These wronged and destitute children are His lambs, and therefore it is the chief work as well as the special privilege of the Church to attend to the rescue of them from a miserable fate. And the Church in all its sections has been quickened with new life from the Lord to undertake and promote this compassionate enterprise. The Church in all its congregations is called upon to seize the opportunity of helping to form the life of the next generation. In a very special sense we may call this the Children's Age. For the work done on their behalf is the wonder of our century and the hope of the next. What a grand spectacle we have in the Sabbath School organisation that penetrates every nook and corner of the land! It has proved an unspeakable blessing as an auxiliary to home training; and if it has been an excellent advantage for the children of Christian parents, surely it ought to be of immeasurably greater benefit to those children who have no Christian influences at home. There should be a Mission Sabbath School in connection with every congregation, so as to gather in every waif and stray off the street, so as to bring them

Digitized by Google

out of their hovels into warm and bright school-rooms, adorned with everything fitted to attract young eyes. Such work can only be carried on effectively by those who, in addition to fervour and devotion, likewise bring to it some measure of ingenuity and inventiveness. The dull, stolid boy has to be interested, while the acute and clever one has to be held in rein, and disciplined to reverence. To influence and hold children who have no real home life, who come out of gloomy haunts, it needs sunshine and unfailing good-humour; the face and voice and whole manner toward those restless imps should reflect a gospel of joy. If they are to be won for Christ and a good life, contact with them must be more frequent, and hold of them tighter, than can be secured by one hour a week in the Sabbath School. Think how little chance there can be of one short Bible lesson on Sunday, even when impressed by picture, counteracting the 'object-lessons' of wickedness that float every day of the week before his eyes. More intimate relations with Mission boys and girls ought to be formed and strengthened. If you cannot moor yourselves alongside of them in their slums, you might set apart a night for them to come and see you in your homes. Such a method of kindness would win them completely, make school work ever so much more orderly, give the young eyes a glimpse of fairer life, and effect a bias towards good that might go on for ever.

Why do scholars of this class drop out of sight on leaving school? What becomes of the senior lads? They do not pass into the ranks of Church membership; they disappear, to turn up again at the public-house or in the Police Court. Previous instruction has touched no depth, or failed to be an adequate discipline of mind or heart, and too soon comes the age when young lads are ashamed to be in a Sunday School, or when they must be retained by methods or associations that appeal to their budding manliness. Good people have been afraid to secularise Christian efforts, but the leakage of past years has led broad-minded workers to devise new methods of dealing with advanced scholars. Chief among these new developments we

Digitized by Google

note the Band of Hope and the Boys' Brigade. The older lads and girls see enough of the mischiefs of drunkenness to be shocked, and are sufficiently in touch with the good to be easily influenced by the Band of Hope to the practice of a sober life. In the Boys' Brigade the secret of power upon the big lads is found by those who approve of it. There are 433 companies in existence, with 1370 officers, and 18,000 members; and more than half of these are in Scotland. The Brigade is strictly a religious movement, and simply employs military organisation, drill, and discipline as the best means of securing the attention of a volatile class, and promoting self-respect, courtesy, *esprit-de-corps*, and other kindred virtues. Professor Drummond finds in it the whole art and mystery of making boys. 'Call them *boys*, which they are, and ask them to sit up in a Sunday class, and no power on earth will make them do it; but put a fivepenny cap upon them and call them soldiers, which they are not, and you can order them about till midnight. The genius who discovered this astounding psychological fact ought to rank with Sir Isaac Newton. As class it was confusion, depression, demoralisation, blasphemy, chaos. As company it is respect, self-respect, enthusiasm, happiness, peace.'

Nowhere ought the Church's vital and creative forces to appear so strong as in trying to provide for, and keep hold of, rescued young people. There is room for Christian inventiveness, and if not exercised here much of our labour will be lost. In the Mission Hall there ought to be a Boys' Club and a Girls' Parlour, with the attractions of games, music, talks about the choice of a situation, and opportunities of comradeship, to take the lads and girls off the streets; to stop the rude horse-play of the street corner, and pass the evenings in healthy recreation. The Glasgow School Board recently opened the school playgrounds on summer evenings for the children, and in London the 'Happy Evening Association' has done good service in brightening the lives of young people. Barnardo's Labour House for Destitute Youths has saved thousands of lads, and

Digitized by Google

suggests a hopeful field in rescue effort. Board Schools should not stand with locked doors all the evening, but be available for social and recreative purposes, while our church halls and mission premises might be employed far more than they are in promoting the forms of a genial and practical Christianity. In the midst of all these social ministries, never should the one high aim be lost sight of—that of winning the young for Christ—that of soul-winning. 'They leave us at sixteen because they are not converted before sixteen.' Let us travail in birth till Christ be formed in them; let us thus see of the travail of our soul, and be satisfied.

The scope of work in the culture and rescue of children requires the most varied efforts, and it is the grandest work we can take in hand. Michael Angelo, walking with a friend along the street, suddenly stooped down, picked up a dirty stone, wiped it and put it in his pocket. His friend, amazed, said, 'What do you see in that stone?' Angelo replied, 'A possible angel.' Weeks after, this friend, entering the artist's studio, was shown a beautiful bit of sculpture with the remark, 'This is the dirty stone out of the gutter, transformed into an angel.' So let us strive to snatch the hapless waifs from all their ills, and shape them to an angel's likeness and life of service.

Digitized by Google

XIII.

WOMAN'S PLACE AND INFLUENCE.

Since the days of the Revolution men of all parties have perceived that the function and sphere of woman must take rank among the five or six foremost questions in social improvement. Before that period, thought on the subject was vague and indefinite, as we may learn from the writings of men like Rousseau and Diderot. The first sentimentalised after his fashion over women, and in practice shocked all the proprieties, while the latter had deep pity for them, writing to this effect: 'In nearly every part of the world, the cruelty of the civil laws against women is added to the cruelty of Nature. They have been treated like weak-minded children. There is no sort of vexation which, among civilised peoples, man cannot inflict upon woman with impunity.' Diderot uttered a sentiment, often on the lips of the other sex, when he said that 'the symbol of women in general is that of the Apocalypse, on the front of which is inscribed Mystery'; and as, in holding this view, he showed a vein of superstition, so he showed a want of sweet reasonableness when he pronounced this dictum: 'The ideas of justice, virtue, vice, goodness, badness, float on the surface of their souls. They have preserved self-love and pursued personal interest with all the energy of nature. Although more civilised than we are outwardly, they have remained true savages inwardly.' If he had lived through the terrible ruin and bloodshed of the Revolution, he would have

Digitized by Google

learned who were the 'true savages'; he would have found that they do not belong to one sex more than another. The problem of woman's sphere and function was a subject of speculation among early writers of the French Illumination; they perceived that the Catholic idea of womanhood was no more adequate to the facts of life than Catholic views of science or politics, but they did not see how the problem could be attacked in a practical way. It was left to the next generation, to Condorcet and others, to make an advance of thought on this question, and point out the lines of social emancipation that were necessary to remove the legal disabilities and redress the physical disadvantages of women. Condorcet's views on the institution of marriage would, beyond doubt, lead to the utter dissolubility and dissoluteness of society, but he carried the question distinctly a stage forward when he pointed out the necessity of uprooting prejudices that have established to such an extent inequality of rights between the two sexes. The views of the French school were adopted by writers in this country, such as William Godwin, who formed an alliance with Mary Wollstonecraft, the celebrated author of the *Rights of Woman*, and John Stuart Mill, who formed a similar alliance, without going through the form of marriage. By these writers it was contended that woman should have full opportunity to develop all the possibilities of her womanhood as man those of his manhood; to them we owe it that a vast improvement in the lot of woman has already been secured, and that, amid profound differences of opinion, freedom for the development of her individual powers and gifts continues to be urged, and makes her emancipation still a burning question of the time.

What light does Christ shed on this present-day subject? What guidance do we get in Scripture with regard to it? In the opening chapters of Scripture—still the battle-ground of the schools, but still the seed plot of great and fruit-bearing thoughts—we are told that 'God created man in His own image—male and female created He them.' In these words we

Digitized by Google

discern a depth of truth and a far-reaching significance as to the peculiar and blended glory of the sexes, not taught in any other literature. Man's true place in Nature is something infinitely higher and better than Huxley, Spencer, or Hæckel has been able to conceive. The ideal of humanity, its plenitude, consists not of one sex, but of both joined together in symmetrical completeness. Man is created in the image of God, but man includes the two sexes, and the two in their ideal fulness are alone capable of reflecting the Divine image perfectly. It is evident that the two sexes are, in the Divine purpose, placed upon an equal footing, and share a common nature, and supplement each the other, and only do this when they are each true to their ideal, and grant to one another the fullest opportunity of reaching it. Such a truth of inspiration exalts the place and destiny of womanhood immeasurably beyond anything seen of it in the ages of virginity, chivalry, or modern enlightenment. Glimpses of that dignity may be caught in what is recorded of the true women of Scripture; it shines with unmatched loveliness in the Marys of the Gospels—especially in the mother of our Lord and the sister of Bethany; and it clothes itself in loveliness of perfect deeds among those women who were made 'new creatures' by the Gospel, and who laboured much with the apostles. 'It is not to mere civilisation, but to the spirit of life in Christ, that woman owes all she has and all she has yet to gain.'[1]

If we take this biblical and Christian ideal of woman's position, it offers a thread to guide us through the labyrinthine problem before us. One of the subjects of deepest interest in the controversies of the day will grow clearer as we look at it from such a standpoint, and richer floods of light will pour upon what is in reserve for womanhood, for the truth concerning her mission remains unexhausted still.

Since humanity is a whole made up of two opposite poles of character—the masculine and feminine, it is a fair and true thing to infer that man and woman are equal—that the one is neither

[1] Robertson of Brighton.

Digitized by Google

inferior nor superior to the other—that they stand on the same level of endowment, and should have a like freedom and a perfect equality of opportunity for the exercise of their gifts. As these gifts are complementary, and are mutually related, whatever subjection may be necessary should also be mutual. 'Submitting yourselves one to another' is apostolic advice that applies to both sexes, and not to the woman only.

Needless to say, this law of equality between the sexes has not been observed in past ages; it has been universally violated, almost entirely ignored. Man has used his stronger bodily power to override this moral law. The brutal egoism of the male sex has for ages kept half the human race in practical serfdom, on the well-worn but unsifted plea that its natural constitution renders it unfit for freedom. And the practice of the past, alike in social usage and legal prescription, has raised the ancient theory almost into the authority of a law of nature that woman is essentially inferior and subordinate to man, and that her office simply is to minister to him and serve him. Such a view can only originate in the coarser nature of man, and can only be perpetuated by 'the base apathy which is satisfied with the actual condition of woman as it is.' Among nations that still treat woman as inferior such a view continues to be widely held, but among the advanced populations of the West a higher estimate of woman is entertained, and wherever her claim to be man's equal and true companion is allowed there the finest types of womanhood are to be found. The recognition of her equality is most pronounced in Britain and America, and specimens of womanhood in these countries will compare immeasurably with anything to be found in Turkey or Dahomey.

But if woman occupies the same plane of gift and quality as man, there may be no difference in the degree, yet difference—radical and deep-seated—in the order of those gifts and qualities. With absolute equality among men there may still be great unlikeness, and a wide variety of capacity, both mental and moral. The distinction of sexes is still more fundamental and complete. As there is one glory of the sun, and another glory

Digitized by Google

of the moon, so there is one glory of manhood, and another glory of womanhood; and as the glory of man is to be himself, so the glory of woman is to be herself, not seeking in any way, the one or the other, to unsex themselves. Everything should be in its own order, true to its own nature, and fill to the utmost its own appointed sphere. The attempt of the man to be like the woman, or of the woman to be like the man, is either impossible, or an abortion. Nature has set barriers which cannot be passed. We cannot alter the essential constitution of the one or the other.

There is a difference between men and women, though not one of inferiority or superiority, and it influences character, methods of looking at things, conduct, and modes of action, in numberless ways. Woman differs from man by instinct, by temper, by the patent facts of physiology, and by a thousand subtleties of sex which permeate her whole being. When we try to differentiate her qualities, we pass into a region of fascinating inquiry, one which the masculine intellect alone can hardly master, which needs the feminine intellect as well carefully and adequately to eliminate. Diderot remarks that 'if we have more reason than women have, they have far more instinct than we have,' a distinction trite enough to let pass, but we are more disposed to question his other dictum: 'Never forget that, for lack of reflection, nothing penetrates down to a certain profoundness of conviction in the understanding of women.' For what is often said to be a characteristic may only be a defect of quality or virtue. A besetting fault of woman is thoughtlessness, and yet, as the prophet hints, that is but a defect of her chief quality. In Mary, the mother of our Lord, and in Mary of Bethany, it was the opposite that made the crown of their womanhood — a fine discretion, a deep thoughtfulness; and therefore an apostle enjoins the old women to 'teach the young women to think discreetly.' Swedenborg makes much of the distinction of the sexes, and says: 'Man was created to be the understanding of truth, and woman the affection of good.' In the days when the battle of higher

Digitized by Google

education for women divided public opinion it used to be said that woman was fitted for practical work, such as housekeeping or charity, but that pure intellect, with its higher training, must be regarded as man's exclusive birthright. Nowadays, the distinctions change once more, and Frederick Harrison sums up the Comtist view of woman's function as being to influence the world 'through the imagination rather than through the reason, by the heart rather than by the head.' It is common still to hear it said that women are all emotion, which implies, of course, that intellect or reason or a cool head is not her forte. Fondness of antithesis is, with many writers, a literary weakness, and nowhere is it more frequently indulged than at this departure of sexual differences. It is the fault, however, of such antitheses to be more epigrammatic than strictly true. All this mapping out of qualities according to fixed rules is a sort of tape measure, unwarranted alike by the common humanity which belongs to the sexes, and by the infinite complexity of actual character among them. To assign affection to the woman and activity to the man, or again to make the man's distinction reason, and the woman's some vague thing named instinct, is a one-sided and arbitrary division of gifts. Are they not common to both? A man incapable of affection would be an ogre, and a woman incapable of activity would be a sloth! And if reason has not been the distinction of woman in the past, do we err in saying that it is because her intellect has been stunted, and the key of knowledge taken from her? The intellectual constitution of both sexes is one and the same, with differences that are dependent on bodily organisation and on a principle of the division of labour aimed at by Nature in all her works. We must not draw the differentiating lines too precisely, and never in such a way as to imply any inferiority of intellect as between the one or the other. It is like, and yet unlike, just as each sex is meant to be different, while each is needed to make the complement of the other. There is something invidious in constantly affirming that no woman ever approached Aristotle, Shakspeare, Raphael, or Mozart, and for

Digitized by Google

the simple reason that woman's subjection in the past has robbed her of the opportunity to attain such greatness, and that such originality of genius is phenomenal and extremely rare even in the other sex. The human intellect in all its magnificence, and the human heart in all its mystery, have been created male and female, and each is incomplete without the other; and the fulness of both, alike in their contrast and resemblance, is necessary to complete the ideal of human life. As soon as intellectual and moral equality is admitted, one is at liberty to be as subtle and thorough as he can in analysing elements of unlikeness between the sexes, in bringing out what is manly and what is womanly, and showing that each should be, out and out, true to itself.

As a general law, man surpasses the woman in stature and physical prowess. It is true that women may develop into Amazons, so as to be a terror in war, or into chainmakers who can toil at a forge all day, plying with hand and foot a twenty-pound hammer; but when they claim equality with us, it is not physical strength which they have in view; they frankly acknowledge their weakness, and note the bearing of this fact on a difference of functions. Again, man surpasses them in that group of endowments where causality and abstraction play a part. But woman surpasses man in power of intuition, subtlety of observation, and imaginative sensibility. Nowhere do womanly gifts of mind appear at the present day with such manifest superiority as in the realm of fictitious literature. In a general way man excels woman in the stronger and sterner elements of character, but woman excels man in the purer and softer elements. Trust, affection, purity, gentleness, thoughtfulness, reverence, belong to the order of qualities that are distinctively feminine. Robustness, strength, and courage are the notes of masculine virtues. The glory of manhood is one, and the glory of womanhood is another, and each type of moral excellence completes the other, and character, alike in man or woman, is most rounded and majestic where qualities of both types are possessed.

Digitized by Google

The same is true regarding powers of action in both sexes. We cannot say that man is more energetic than woman; on the contrary, in the savage state the male is the idler, and the woman does all the work. When we rise in the scale of civilisation they are both alike endowed with active force, but it operates differently, owing, no doubt, to organic differences. Man's capacities for action are greater in mass and physical strength, and culminate in a majesty of will, such as Cæsar or Cromwell manifested, but no woman could ever approach; while woman's capacities for action are superior to his in flexibility of movement, passive endurance, love of creating rather than destroying, and power to touch coarse and common things in such a way as to refine them and lift them into something beautiful and sublime. Man's force is dynamic, inventing machines and augmenting material resources for weal or woe; but woman's force is that of the imponderable elements—caloric, magnetism, or electricity—which can beautify or blast without any visible sign.

If equality of the sexes be the purpose of creation, and the evident teaching of Scripture and Christianity, the doctrine must not only be accepted, but carried out to its legitimate consequences. The problem of woman's place and culture and work can alone be understood in the light of first principles, or as we prefer to say, in the light of Christ, which takes us further into the workshop of Nature than any other light, and reveals to us the designs of the 'only wise God.' By a glance of intuition He penetrates to the heart of the question, and sets it far ahead of the slow march of reason. It needs the united wisdom and insight of a man and a woman to form a true judgment on this subject, and Christ, in whom alone this union can be found, has given such a judgment, and acted upon it. Here we prefer the Master to any disciple, even when the latter is Paul the Apostle, who, when he ventures judgment on the question, has to say, 'I speak this of permission, and not of commandment.' It is admitted by Mill that Christ taught the equality of human beings, but he asserts that

Digitized by Google

Christianity will never practically teach it, and has sanctioned institutions opposed to it. If these things are so, we appeal from Christianity straight to Christ, and in His presence as our only Master accept the principle of the equality of all human beings as a cardinal truth in His pronouncement regarding the Kingdom of God.

Equality of opportunity to cultivate God-given powers must be accepted as a necessary inference. Woman should not be debarred from any educational advantage—from any sort of culture that is fitted to elicit, balance, and complete her gifts of mind and heart. Intellectually, a 'fair field and no favour' has been denied to her in the past. Seventy years ago it was considered unwomanly to learn Latin or Greek, or write a book; and Sydney Smith had to assure readers of the *Edinburgh Review* that a woman might learn mathematics without neglecting her infant. At that time a different class of studies was imparted to women, and their minds were fed by different food. It was a kind of education that left out intellectual effort, and handed them over to unregulated emotions and fancies. A happy advance on that old notion of woman's culture has taken place in consequence of the higher respect paid to her intellect. With a growing recognition of the equality of the sexes, it is felt that woman's studies should not essentially differ from those of man. The education of the one should be laid on the same lines as the education of the other. When women learn Greek and Latin, mathematics and physiology, it is unjust to say that they are adopting male studies and male ambitions, that they want to unsex themselves, and that they only become 'pale caricatures of the men they rival.' On the contrary, since they have intellects as supple and appreciative as the intellects of men, they are entitled to an education as thorough as that of men. Whatever is best for the training of the masculine intelligence will prove to be best for the feminine intelligence. There is no such thing as a woman's aspect of classics, mathematics, art, or science as distinct from man's, and there cannot be different methods of instruction in order to master

Digitized by Google

these departments of knowledge. For all purposes of education and training, then, the method for teaching both sexes must be one and the same. Tastes, of course, may differ as to the subjects to be acquired. We cannot all study all kinds of subjects. Women may take to some more readily than to others, just as men show like preferences; but they may justly demand the most absolute freedom in the choice of subjects to which their intellects are attached, and should have the means of knowing all that is to be known, and knowing it in the best way. Equal intellectual endowment involves the title to enter and take possession of every province of knowledge, and therefore in the matter of higher education, university training, medical instruction, and literary culture, the claim of women is as broad as that of men.

Since Nature has endowed the sexes with equal capacities for thought, and since instruction is now imparted to both with more equality, these common rights and privileges ought to be more eagerly taken advantage of by the other sex. If the test of civilisation be the place which it gives to women, the test of worthiness to hold that place should be the use which they make of it. Although the prejudices that have established inequality of rights are considerably broken down, the theory of women's education is still too much held in the trammels of social convention. With greater freedom and opportunity, that education befitting her place is yet in a backward state. It still differs in kind and degree from that of men, and, being confined to a smattering of modern languages and a few elegant accomplishments, it acts in cynical defiance of all womanly ideals, and leaves her to be a plaything for men in their idle hours. This kind of education makes her the victim of frivolous excitement, gives her a taste for no other form of literature but that of the novel, and dooms her to that of a doll's life. Instead of drawing forth the glory of womanliness, so as to raise the moral tone of society and mitigate the harshness of life everywhere, it tends to degrade and sterilise and unsex her.

In consequence of this shallow and defective training, we

Digitized by Google

have a hollow and frivolous society, whose manners and morals are not favourable to the growth of a pure and honourable state of life. The young women of the period avail themselves of their freedom, but instead of bringing maidenly modesty and purity to bear upon the opposite sex, they are apt to fall into the temptation of becoming butterflies, or of adopting male amusements and ambitions, male modes of thought, talk, and dress. It is sad to see women resorting to the imitation of masculine ideals, as if they were ashamed of their own sex; infinitely sad when we know that there is no beauty on earth which can be compared to the beauty of true womanhood. Nor is it less to be deplored when our girls give themselves up to the hunt for pleasure through all hours not given to sleep, and imagine that their principal charm in the eyes of the young males is to be silly and frivolous, to talk about nothing but the endless giving and receiving of invitations, the endless arrangements of parties and dresses, the endless excitements of an ostentatious and artificial life. Such is the kind of life young women are tempted, because they have been trained, to pursue in trying to gratify their social instincts, and form acquaintances which precede love and marriage. The instinct of affinity for the opposite sex is the strongest, holiest, and most universal instinct which the Creator has planted in human nature. It is an instinct capable of perversion, and, when perverted, it produces tragedies, swift and sure, of downfall and shame; but when wisely directed it becomes the source of all that is most unselfish and sweet, most loving and lovely in human life. This same instinct has been the inspiration of all truest poetry and romance; it has laid the foundation of that happy home where childhood so often passes like a dream of heaven. While it is the holiest and deepest instinct of our being, the utmost difficulty exists in securing its legitimate satisfaction. Society is an immense arrangement for allowing young people to know each other, and yet it awkwardly contrives to leave that object unfulfilled. The difficulty of modern marriage arises from the imperfect acquaintance of those who in vain strive to know each

Digitized by Google

other in the busy crowd. Our social system, as at present organised, does not encourage that freedom, sincerity, and openness of intercourse which ought to precede a lifelong alliance. In the lower ranks of life the home is so mean and overcrowded as to be unfavourable to the meeting of the sexes, and acquaintances are largely formed in shops and factories, and even on the streets. Curiosity and gossip are also insufferable barriers to natural association of the sexes, and this drives young men and women into clandestine arrangements and assignations of a kind perilous to virtue. Among the leisured classes, young people are not more favourably situated for knowing each other. The elaborate machinery of dinners and dresses, of ball-rooms and theatres, does not conduce to anything like spontaneous and genuine intimacy. It is all too imitative and unreal; it breeds too unwholesome a kind of acquaintance and happiness. There ought to be more simplicity and openness in the relations of the sexes. The true remedy is to let girls have greater freedom, rescuing them from the doll's life, teaching them to look far more after themselves, and then allowing them to cultivate the acquaintance of the other sex as easily as that of their own. It is only inveterate social prejudice and the evil tongue of scandal that prevents the exercise of such liberty. It is the only condition of young people getting to know each other, and making a choice that shall be a true union of hearts. At present the choosing has to be done with the smallest amount of knowledge, and hence irreparable mischiefs follow, as the Divorce Courts lamentably prove. Want of liberty to walk, and drive, and play outdoor games in company prevents those fuller and more satisfactory interviews which are needed to let young people know their mutual fitness to spend a happy life together. Let our young women pluck up heart and emancipate themselves from the thraldom of ignorance; let them make war upon all the artificiality of the present system, and construct something simpler, more independent, and more worthy of their position.

Among the abuses of this God-implanted instinct of love for

Digitized by Google

the opposite sex, and largely due to what we have just been contending against, we must rank that social evil which presents woman in her wrong place and exerting a wrong influence. There is a class, counted by thousands in all our towns and cities, who take their womanhood and prostitute it to the vilest traffic, who do not—the most of them—choose such a life by any act of their own, but have been decoyed into it by some deed of villainy, or forced into it by stress of circumstance. Many of them are on the streets because of the false education which confounds ignorance with virtue, and does not warn or prepare them against the dangers that prowl about their path. Whether to condemn or pity these unfortunates, we know not; and what to say on the painful Social Problem they create we prefer to express in what one of their own sex has, with Christ-like compassion, written: 'Of this class of persons, and of this sorest of human griefs, we are never forgetful; no, not for a day. The subject is thought too painful a one to be specially treated, therefore I think it the more needful to assert that these, our fellow-women, are not forgotten by us; on the contrary, we feel continually—and the public must be continually reminded of it—that there is no analogy whatsoever among men, however miserable certain classes of men may be, to the wholesale destruction which goes on from year to year among women—destruction of bodies, of consciences, of souls; and the existence of this class would alone have been enough to urge us, who are happier, to raise our voices to claim what we claim now—freedom and power—to reach and deal with great Social Evils in their beginnings, and not only in a limited degree in their effects. At present, and indeed ever since the world began, this class of people have been generally left out of account in all theories of life, and in the framing of legislative and social measures, except so far as society has had to be protected against them as a public nuisance, and so far as individual missionary efforts have attempted to restore a few of the fallen. I think that any theory of life or public engagements is thoroughly unscientific as well as unchristian which

Digitized by Google

leaves this mass of people out of account, which deals with it as a fact which must be endured, but which must be pushed as far as possible into a corner, and fenced round so as to annoy the rest of the community as little as possible. Such economy resembles that of an indolent housewife who is aware of a certain chamber in her house which is full of the accumulated dust of years, but which she fears to look into, hopeless of any cleansing, and the door of which she keeps carefully closed, content so long as the rest of the dwelling is not fatally infected by the presence of the evil.'[1]

Having spoken of woman's place as equal to man's in the design of creation, we come now to treat of her influence in the economy of life, and this introduces us to the much controverted question of her function, sphere, mission, or kingdom, as it is variously termed. What is known as the Sphere of Woman is only a Hemisphere founded of necessity on the vital difference of sex; but it is the upper and nobler half of the orb of human duty. While sexual distinction is at the very root of the matter, it is needful at the outset to divest our mind of the idea that the extent of woman's sphere may be more restricted than that of man's sphere, that the scope of her work must be viewed as operating within preconceived and traditionary provinces. As representing half the population of our race, and as the equal of man—his comrade and fellow-worker—woman may perform a function as essential, fill a sphere as ample, execute a mission as wide, and sway a kingdom as great, as that of man.

Now woman's kingdom is the Home; her highest office is that of Wifehood and Motherhood. There is nothing more sacred or more beautiful under the sun. Never must this old ideal of woman's usefulness be allowed to fade in her own eyes, or in the eyes of the other sex. The experience of thousands of years proves that the sphere in which women act at their highest is the family, and the strongest side is their affection. In fathoming man's love we soon strike bottom; but plummet will be dropped in vain into the abyss of woman's affection.

[1] *Woman's Work and Woman's Culture*, by Josephine E. Butler.

Digitized by Google

This gives her supremacy in the home, this becomes the inspiration of the tenderest and most intimate ties, this makes silent but irresistible appeal to our best instincts and highest interests. Her chief glory is to be found in governing the family, and one speaks of it as 'a grander task than to govern the State.' It is, therefore, no worthy representation; nay, it hardly rises above the idea of a savage, to say that the function of woman is to bring children into the world, to nurse them till they can fare for themselves. Wifehood and motherhood denote an office of far higher intention and influence, an office nobler than any other on earth, and for which the richest developments in education, virtue, and religion are absolutely required. Women are capable in directions where men are not; and this holds true especially in the home sphere, and in the nurture and management of children. Set a man to superintend a family of children, and he is like an elephant brooding chickens; the more anxiously he broods, the more awfully he flattens them. It needs womanly thought and tact and patience—a mother's love and sympathy—to keep the household going smoothly. To her is consigned the work of training children in their most impressionable years, and the woman who brings up a family well renders invaluable service to the State. A nation will be great and prosperous, just as it is made up of such families; and for this reason we exalt woman's work in the domestic circle to a place of supremacy.

But her kingdom at home does not consist merely in the government of her offspring. For a true home gathers to itself many other ties, and affords scope for the cultivation of wider interests, in regard to which woman's influence tells with quiet but profound effect. All that pertains to the order, comfort, and adornment of home is secured by her deft fingers. Without her presence a house or mansion is not a home. As it has been well said, 'The male bird may construct the nest with sticks, but only the hen can line it with moss and down.' Man has a part assigned to him in home life. He guards it against all dangers, provides for it the means of subsistence,

Digitized by Google

and brings to it echoes from the outer world. Indoors, too, he is the guide and judge on decisive occasions. Woman plays her part indoors altogether. Ignorant of her husband's business, and unfit for it, she attends to and embellishes her home, and strives to render it attractive and pleasant. Not only does she tend her children in every phase of their lives; lulling them to sleep, soothing them, amusing them, and teaching them how to speak and walk, but she aims to make her home a restful shade for her husband and a hospitable trysting-place for friends. Her womanly ways become manifest in all the arrangements of the house, betraying her personality in every humble detail, and diffusing a spirit of order and beauty, love and peace, that calms and blesses all who come within its influence.

It will at once be evident that the woman who makes such a home does not leave her children to a nurse during the first years, then put them under a governess, and send them away to be finished at a boarding-school. That may be the method of one whose education has only made her an accomplished nonentity, and a plaything for her husband. But the mother who makes a true home—it may only consist of room and kitchen or be a mansion—teaches her children through love and insight and sympathy; teaches them hour by hour, by the magic of voice and smile and song; teaches them ideas more philosophical than they will ever again acquire—ideas of God and truth, and implants sentiments in their young minds —sentiments of duty and sacrifice, which will remain until they breathe their last sigh. Yes, this woman, this uncultured but wise woman, has taught all that, and would think you laughed at her if you told her so. But her son will, perhaps, be a man of genius, or her daughter the most virtuous of women; and when they come to full manhood and womanhood, when his genius has borne the finest fruit, and her virtue has brought the richest treasure of joy in prosperity and consolation in misfortune, all will lovingly be traced back to the first gentle shapings of that maternal hand. Such is family life as God intended woman to make it, and as the wisest and best among

Digitized by Google

us have known it to be. What has given woman this paramount position and influence in the Home? For she did not occupy it in ancient society, where she was treated as an inferior being, nor does she occupy it in the East, where Buddha and Mahomet have placed her in subjection. Christianity alone has given to the mother her might and her majesty, and woman has repaid the debt, and will continue to repay it, in the moral progress of Christianity, which is largely due to her influence in home life.

Before we pass away from the Home, let us notice another phase of the Problem—the position of the domestic servant. The question of 'Domestic Service' has long been a burning one, and complaints from mistress and maid seem to grow louder as the stir among women for freer conditions goes on. Mistresses tell us that the worries of servantgalism grow worse and worse, and the complaint of 'no good servants' is met by the contrary one of 'no good mistresses.' Notwithstanding these clamours, it must not be overlooked that there are still many considerate mistresses and many sensible maids, and that many an illustration may still be found of that Christian sisterly spirit which leads a mistress to set aside caste distinctions and treat her servant as a friend, with some claim to the joys and refinements of home life. Domestic servants are too often treated not as sisters but as strangers or as hired creatures of a lower order, who are supposed to have no ideal of excellence —no ambition—who are allowed no exemption from calls on their time, and are thus doomed to a monotonous life, their mental and social condition uncared for, save for the occasional good book or tract. Now all this is wrong, and Christianity is opposed to it as a species of wage-earning slavery. It teaches that all useful service is honourable, and should be permeated by a spirit of lovingkindness. No service is more worthy than that which is rendered by our domestics, and none tells more powerfully for comfort or the opposite on the whole family. When a true-hearted responsible woman serves in a family, her work is on an infinitely higher platform than that of the vulgar

Digitized by Google

little shop-girl or the rough-tongued factory-girl who presumes to despise her. Let Christ's idea be realised by women of all classes—mistresses as well as maids—that *ministry* is their true vocation, and domestic service will become ennobled, full of profit to itself and of blessing to the Home.

Female influence is so great and dominating in the life of the family, and the family is such an all-important unit of national well-being, that many hold strongly by the conviction that the home sphere should absorb woman's whole energies and entire life; and they protest, in the name of womanly grace and purity, against her passing forth into any of the outer interests and occupations of life. Such is the Comtist ideal of woman's place and influence. 'Positivism,' says Comte, 'encourages, on intellectual as well as moral grounds, full and systematic expression of the feeling of veneration for women in the sacred retirement of their homes. They will feel no difficulty in accepting their position as spontaneous priestesses of Humanity, they will feel no longer the rivalry of a vindictive Deity. . . . In a word, man will in those days kneel to woman, and to woman alone.' Looked at from a religious point of view, this exaltation of woman to an Idol in public and private life is simply blasphemous; viewed socially, this glorified queen-bee kind of existence presents no true or enviable ideal of the average wife's and mother's everyday life, and pays no real homage to the wide variety of capacity, both intellectual and social, which exists among women no less than among men. It is urged by many that women should not be encouraged to renounce domestic duties, and throw off feminine reserve, by mixing with men in outside pursuits; and, no doubt, that appeal had some force in former days when population was small, and the Home, with its arts of spinning, weaving, and baking, gave ampler scope than now to woman's work. But the growth of population, and the removal of home industries by machinery to large workshops, have so completely altered the conditions of life for men and women alike that new opportunities for both sexes become a clamant need of our times.

Digitized by Google

For five hundred years population in this country only doubled itself, but during this century it has increased by four and a half times; and this great fact has necessitated a wider sphere of activity for women, and made her emancipation one of the gravest questions of the day. It is a stock argument against women's rights that any extension of these rights is certain to unsex women, and rob them of what is womanly. Now, while such a thing is possible, the most prejudiced opponent cannot fail to observe that the ideal of womanliness need not suffer harm by transcending the limit of the marriage tie and the sphere of home influence. Indeed, harm has been done by setting up wifehood and motherhood as the exclusive occupation of woman, and thereby making marriage the be-all and end-all of life. Marriage has long been considered the sole function to which it is right or decent for women to aspire, and the theory which makes marriage their only career, and the future a blank without such a prospect, is responsible for some of the most degrading and mischievous influences, alike on the home and in society. It implies not only that women should spend the most of life in preparing for an event which may never occur, but it teaches them to hanker after husbands, and practise wiles that every fine womanly instinct shrinks from and abhors. The ideal of womanhood must not be tied hard and fast to marriage and the government of a home. The capture of a rich young man must cease to be regarded as one of the chief prizes of life. The power must be increased of saying that woman's chief end is not to glorify the like of him, and enjoy his money for the rest of life. Many women there are, and among the excellent, who do not care to accept the round of worries and sordid economies and never-ending drudgeries that belong to housekeeping—who find an exclusively home life but little to their taste, and show small aptitude for its special duties. It is an evil to force them to choose between a life for which they are unfitted and a life of inaction. Therefore they ought to have a choice of careers, what Burns sings of as the 'glorious privilege of being independent'; an

Digitized by Google

opportunity of showing the other sex what they surrender on accepting an offer of marriage. The claim urged by themselves, and on their behalf, is a 'fair field and no favour,' a request not to be debarred from occupations which are congenial to them, a demand to engage freely in any kind of work, either public or private, for which they feel they have a vocation, a plea of liberty to choose from a larger number of useful and honourable activities than marriage affords, an opportunity to support themselves and thus be emancipated from their present state of economic dependence. Such liberty had been given to women in certain directions long before their emancipation was talked of. A considerable number of them have gained a livelihood by teaching the young in early years or acting as governesses, but this field of activity might be indefinitely enlarged, if by instruction they were only fitted to enter upon it. As a profession for women, that of education is surely most suited to their taste, and is one for which they have by nature the best endowments. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the influence they exert upon the daily developing mind of youth. They are more deeply read in child nature than men are, and know better how to educate it, while that divine faculty, Patience, is especially theirs. 'Women seem to have more patience as teachers, more quickness in seeing whether the pupil understands, more skill in adapting their explanations to the peculiarities of the pupil's mind, and certainly a nicer discernment of his or her character.' They bring a womanly gift to the execution of educational tasks, and this gift belongs to the very highest order of influence, and illustrates anew that variety of human talent which it is one of the chief problems of the future how best to utilise in the interests of the individual and of society. Nor can there be any doubt that women are competent to undertake the very highest educational work, but to do it well they must have greater facilities for gaining a thorough and systematic knowledge of larger subjects. They must be admitted to the same advantages of colleges, lecture-rooms, and libraries as the other sex have too long monopolised.

Digitized by Google

Much has been done by University Local Examinations, and the work of college-making for women in Cambridge, and elsewhere, to stimulate among them the desire of knowledge, and give them higher efficiency in teaching. Current satires on the 'strong-minded woman,' or the young B.A. from Girton, all logic and stand-up collar, are somewhat stale, now that the highest intellectual position has been won, and women learn to take that position quite naturally and easily. When they have graduated in a true scientific education, we may expect them to use it as a guide with simplicity and directness, because of those instincts for practical life that have come to them as an inheritance of many ages.

Another sphere for woman's work, largely unoccupied, is to be found in the profession of medicine. There are departments of medical practice natural to each of the sexes. It must be admitted that men are rather out of place in midwifery cases; surely it is masculine intrusion to undertake that which natural instinct assigns to woman as her proper field of labour. Such was not the case in ancient days when women had less freedom. We learn from the pages of the *Iliad* and from the books of Moses that this branch of medical art was then mainly in the hands of women, and sentiment and reason alike concur in urging that it ought to be so still. Most of the complaints incident to women ought to be treated by female practitioners, for the simple reason that sisterly help and skill would be more appropriate than could be given by the other sex. There is no career open to women in which they can exert their feminine gifts with more marvellous effect than in that of medicine. Hitherto the difficulty of prosecuting it has been the want of education and proper training, aggravated and rendered well-nigh insuperable by the opposition of prescriptive right and social sentiment. The medical profession has done its utmost to shut the door against women obtaining a degree, and feelings of prudery have been urged against giving to women the same instruction in medical knowledge given to men, whether conjointly or in separate classes. The first difficulty has been

Digitized by Google

overcome, and lady doctors are now in practice, drawing patients from all parts of the country, because, although they have successfully gone through the whole course of study, and taken their degree, they are women still, and bring their womanly insight and sympathy to the performance of their duties. As to the other difficulty, while practically closing this avenue to women's work, it is destined to yield as the conviction strengthens that women must be duly qualified to make way in it, and that if they are to practise medicine thoroughly at all, their training must be identical and equally complete with that of the other sex. A great enlargement of women's sphere has been obtained by their admission to industrial pursuits. If every woman could be provided with a household for the exercise of her function, and if, moreover, every woman were fitted or disposed for such a sphere, there would be no need of any other employment; but the actual facts of the situation are very different. Our social system does not and cannot provide every woman with a home, for about fifty-two per cent. of our population are females, and only forty-eight per cent. males. Emigration carries off many young men to the Colonies, largely adding to a disproportion of the sexes. With 700,000 more women than men in this country, many are debarred from those noble tasks which belong to family life, and constrained to look elsewhere for the employment of their activity. Again, with large numbers of women, the question is one of having to work or starve. Not only must they work for their own support, but for that of others—daughters who have to support parents, wives who have to be breadwinners for disabled husbands, widows who have to provide for their children. All these will rather work than beg or go on the poor-rate, and who will deny them permission to work? Industrial freedom has, therefore, become an economic necessity for thousands of women. Apart from the difficulty of a sufficient outlet for women's energies in the care of a household, there is a higher class, with education and leisure, who object to be confined within the narrow limits of domestic life, who find it

Digitized by Google

little to their taste, and feel the injustice of being told that Hobson's choice of marriage or nothing else is the only career open to them. They maintain that exclusive restrictions should not come between them and any kind of independent activity for which they have a special aptitude. Instead of women being brought up to regard marriage as an escape from the duty of earning their own living, the new school teach that the duty of every woman is to fit herself for earning her own living, to demand the right to earn it, and that the duty of men is not to hinder her by any legal or social restrictions. Already this view has found wide acceptance, and a great change has taken place for the better in opening doors of industrial activity to women-workers. It is no disgrace now for a woman to earn her own living, and it is infinitely more useful and honourable on the one hand than to be the doll-wife in a rich man's house, and infinitely more independent and happy on the other than to live with drunken husbands in daily terror of their lives. As a proof of the great change which has taken place in the position of women, it has been estimated that about 200,000 are engaged in industrial occupations, and that about half the grown-up women in this country are wage-earners.

It is regretted, however, by some writers of our time that women have entered the field of industry, and the plea urged for restriction is that it takes her out of her proper sphere, that the laws of Nature have constituted man the stronger animal of the two, and woman the mother of his children, that each has a province natural to their sex, and any encroachment upon it by the other is unnatural and repulsive. Writers of the Comtist school, with their exalted ideal of women in the Home, represent that when she enters the labour-market, she encroaches upon male occupations that entail unwomanly fatigues and tend to unsex her both physically and morally; and they call upon the State to free her from factory labour, and from the demoralisation of competing with men in industrial careers. Whatever force there may be in such pleas, it is too late in the day to think of removing nearly four millions of wage-earning women

Digitized by Google

from the employments in which they are occupied. It would set them free from the dragon of toil, but free only to starve, or go into the poorhouse, or walk the streets. The real problem is not how to exclude them from industrial spheres, but how to protect them there; it is not whether women ought to work for daily bread, but how they shall work so as not to be overtasked or underpaid. The pressing question is to determine how their industries, at home or in the factory, affect them physically and morally, and to devise improvements that will enable them to work honourably without damage to themselves or their families. There are large masses of female workers who drag out a miserable existence. Married as well as single women are employed in chainmaking and nail trades, and evidence laid before the Royal Commission on Labour proves that the weight of chain they strike at the forge is too heavy, and the thickness of the bar they have to cut with the oliver is often beyond their strength. In many cases, mothers take their children to the shops, and place them in boxes or swings, covering them over to keep the dirt from them. They would only be too pleased to leave the work, for many of them are thrashed to make them go. It is well known that the death-rate among children of the factory hands is very high, being registered at Blackburn as 194 in every 1000; while the lowest deep of unskilled women's labour is only matched by the life in death of men in alkali works, or in those chemical works of Glasgow and Rutherglen where chromate of potash is manufactured. Besides these evils attaching to women's industrial work, another is to be found in the unjust and arbitrary fines imposed by harsh employers, so as to filch a portion of their scanty earnings; nor do they receive the same wages which are paid to men for doing the same work, even when it may be done with the deftness and taste and accuracy which men cannot bring to it. The remedy for all these evils must be sought in a better organisation of all industries, that will secure for women as well as men better conditions under which to work, and so deliver them from a

Digitized by Google

position of enforced dependence. Women must take counsel with those who can best teach them to organise their industrial energies, and the counsellors must, in a large measure, be themselves women, with capacity and power to obtain for their toiling sisters every fair advantage and entire freedom.

This last suggestion points to another sphere of influence from which woman has hitherto been excluded, but to which a claim on her behalf is strongly made at the present time—the right of political enfranchisement. Admission to political functions is that which presents the latest and the acutest phase in the problem of her emancipation. As her education and liberty go on, and a larger number of pursuits is opened to her, it is inevitable that her right to the franchise must become a pressing question. And the exact nature of the question may be differently stated. Does the absolute equality of the sexes divide at this point? and does Nature pronounce a radical difference, assigning politics to man as his peculiar and natural province in the same way that the home has been assigned as woman's kingdom? Or, again, as man has a place in the family along with the wife and mother, so may not woman have a place in the management of the State, and bring to it womanly gifts and aptitudes of the very highest value? How shall we know and determine this? Public opinion is represented as being entirely opposed to woman's suffrage, and the great bulk of educated and cultivated women are said to be dead against it. Much weight, undoubtedly, must attach to this counting of heads, but it is an argument which has been used at almost every stage in the movement for enlarging woman's place and influence. On what foundation does this argument rest? Is Nature, is woman's essential constitution, opposed to her presence in the field of political responsibilities and privileges? Or is it legal disability and social convention that once more stand in the way? Let us try to find out, and let us clear our minds of all cant. If Nature closes the door to the political sphere, the advocates of woman's rights will knock in vain; the franchise may be extended to woman, but if it

Digitized by Google

only pushes her into man's place, we may be sure that Nature will thrust her back again with a vengeance. But if there is no radical hindrance to woman's exercise of political functions, if it shall not sterilise or unsex her, but widen her legitimate influence, and bring a more delicate quality and finer moral tone into the region of State affairs, then opposition to her freedom in this sphere can only be based on prejudice and sentiment, and it must go down before the rising tide of enlightenment and progress. There are strenuous women, increasing every year as they become better educated and endowed with physical and mental gifts, who rebel against the traditional notions that have limited the sphere of activity of their sex, and will not be deterred from seeking freedom to hold any position in public life by the fear of disregarding a 'primary social truth' or masculating some preconceived ideal of woman's true function. If this open and unbiassed attitude be taken up, no reasonable man needs to contemplate the issue but with serenity and confidence. Instead of asserting that 'women are not qualified for the functions which their worst advisers would thrust upon them,' instead of regarding such a thing as a 'hazardous experiment' and 'putting the State to a fearful risk,' we should rather be prepared to see the experiment tried. Woman has not turned out such a dangerous creature in any of the other provinces of her emancipation that we should be afraid to extend her electoral privileges, or even allow her to sit as a representative in Parliament. If women are naturally unfitted for such functions, what can be the sense of excluding them by every sort of legal restriction? and if they are not, who shall dare to deprive the community of the benefit of those services which they are competent to render? It is impossible to say what they may and ought to do, until we have copious proofs of what they have done and can do. If the fundamental factor of sex is against them, it will be a vain attempt for them to intrude into political life; but if it is not, and if, on the contrary, their very womanliness be one of those facts of nature which not only needs no buttressing at

Digitized by Google

our hands, but may be employed to buttress the State, it would be extremely foolish, nay, positively unjust from the political side, to shut any door in their faces.

Influenced by such considerations as these, we see how idle and unfruitful much of the discussion on this question has been and is likely to be. It may be that woman's admission to the political sphere will bring a superfluity of sentiment into public affairs, will run the risk of letting in a perfect flood of emotion. An opponent of feminine importation into politics says: 'Women feel far more keenly than men; they take matters in a more personal way. . . . The reason is that woman has a finer and more highly-strung constitution than man; she was never meant for this rough and dirty work, and her virtues turn to vices when she is pushed into man's place.' It is true that women are more inspired by feeling than men are, but the emotional temperament of the sterner sex can show itself also, as, for example, in the Jingo; and police magistrates, and even some alarmist writers on the dangers of female suffrage, are not exempt from the ravages of emotion. It is noticeable among women who come much in contact with the world how cool of head and nerve they are, how practically shrewd and matter-of-fact they can be. Look at schoolmistresses, girls in drapery establishments, and post-office lady clerks, and observe that while true to their sex they are anything but reservoirs of this flood of emotion. The women who serve on School Boards, County Councils, and Charity Organisation Societies, have not shown themselves manifestly incompetent by indulging their emotional capacity to excess. They have given convincing proof of their ability to temper enthusiasm by self-restraint in their successful management of philanthropic enterprises, and more valid reason must therefore be given for excluding them from the sphere of political service. If woman is intellectually fit to advise her husband, train her children, and govern her household, should not all this qualify her for practical administration in affairs of State? The State is an aggregation of families, and qualities that have fitted her for the government

Digitized by Google

of the home might, in a great measure, fit her for the larger service of the State. Such facts and experiences strengthen the claim that in this region women should have a fair field, and natural selection, here as elsewhere, must be left to do its work without any hindrance from us. Our business is to secure the equal rights to which, as human beings, they are entitled, nor need we fear lest they choose any service to which a sense of duty does not call them, which is just saying that if we do justice, Nature may safely be left to herself.

And if the right to exercise their gifts in the service of the State be acquired, we may rest assured that it will be, in every sense, true womanly service. It will not turn woman into an abortive man, but give her an opportunity to purify, soften, and refine the asperities of party warfare. Especially in those Social Questions, which are coming to the front as the chief political factors of the future, woman's influence will tell most happily; and the history of her efforts and failures in rectifying social abuses will be of immense value in working out an ultimate and effective rectification.

By this enlargement of her sphere, a conservative influence would be brought to bear upon the most important question of all—the future of religion in our land. What form it will assume it is difficult to prognosticate. Any national recognition of Divine guidance admits of some doubt when we observe, in our national councils and leading statesmen, a thinly-disguised Paganism or Atheism, on occasions when religion is in question. State affairs have for the last few years been more and more severed from the tokens of religion, and reverence for it has been disappearing from high places. But women are strong on the side of affection, sentiment, and aspiration, and therefore on the whole devouter than men. Great thoughts come from the heart, and the heart has a surer instinct in the greatest matters than the understanding. Women have a keener vision for the spiritual world than men, and we cannot doubt that if they were endowed with electoral rights and admitted to the councils of the nation, the cause of pure and

Digitized by Google

undefiled religion would be exalted to a safer and more eminent place in the land.

Woman owes much, indeed everything, to Christ and Christianity. No wonder, then, that woman has a love for the Saviour exceeding the love which any man can have for Him, and no wonder that her widest and holiest sphere of usefulness is still to be found in His service. He drew a circle of simple but noble women after Him, and they won nothing less than emancipation of every kind by adherence to Him. And it is so still. His gospel is still their emancipation, and opens 'wide doors and effectual' for them to enter in, and find new spoil, and exert a more widely beneficial influence. In the Kingdom of God which He has set up they have a place, a work, an influence, that lift them out of all selfishness, and clothe them in garments of praise. Here the full scope of woman's moral rank and spiritual destiny is recognised, and here her mission finds its field of richest fruitfulness and reward. Here the demand for new spheres is amply met by new openings for her labours of love. Here she uses life for its highest purposes by ceasing to think of its chief aim as luxurious enjoyment, and learning to 'glorify God and enjoy Him for ever.' Let her, then, be true to the faith and following of Christ; let her attain the ideal of womanliness in the light of Christ; and let her show the social sides of the mind of Christ in 'whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, and whatsoever things are of good report.'

Digitized by Google

XIV.

THE CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT.

ANY reader of honest purpose who turns to Holyoake's *History of Co-operation* for an account of the rise and growth of this movement, will be surprised to learn through what ferments of thought and storms of opposition it passed before reaching a goal which commands the admiration of the best thinkers and greatest statesmen of our time. Noblemen and bishops and professors proudly accept the invitation of co-operators to give inaugural addresses at annual gatherings; but in early days, when the movement was inchoate and obscure, it was ignored or suspected by leading parties, alike in Church and State.

At first its advocates got no assistance and but scant justice from those in charge of the Christian religion. During the pioneer period of its history, from 1820 to 1844, Robert Owen of New Lanark was the great master of the agitation—a man whom the poet Southey classed in a triad of men who had in that generation given an impulse to the moral world; yet religious society treated him as a heresiarch, and assailed him with the hate of hate and the scorn of scorn. God had put it into his heart to know what power dwelt in material surroundings for the awakenment of character, and it led him to propound the doctrine that 'man's character was formed for him, and not by him,' and, still further, to coin the audacious phrase that 'man is the creature of circumstances.' Such unguarded statements of a truth he saw with a prophet's eye laid him open to grave mis-

Digitized by Google

conception. He was unskilled in the art of concealing thought and safe-guarding opinion; heedless of the mischief that ignorance and prejudice can do to the best cause. The brunt of those misunderstandings he had to meet, as seldom fell to the lot of man; and he, Welshman as he was, did not always show a meek front, but sometimes threatened a crusade for the denunciation of all religions. The wits of literature nicknamed him the 'Circumstantial Philosopher,' and theologians, resolute with their inferences, easily proved his doctrine of Character to be a denial of man's moral responsibility. Truly did the doctrine of Circumstances then need an expounder and an apostle, for they were working infinite wrong and misery in the land. Industry had developed a fierce competitive spirit—a passion of individualism. Self-interest was deified. The population of town and country alike was huddled into dens like animals; women worked like beasts of burden in the mines; children were used in factories to cheapen labour; and the wage-earners, deprived of the fruits of their industry, were incited by vehement orators to take up arms in revolt. To rectify this social and industrial anarchy was the undertaking of Robert Owen, and he, gifted with insight and judgment to know that circumstances do make or mar, and with wealth and position and power to put into force right circumstances, went forth on his Co-operative enterprise, and fulfilled his mission with a nobility of nature that won the homage of princes, and with a brotherly sympathy that endeared him to the sons of toil.

When he spoke of man as the creature of circumstances, he would have been nearer his own real meaning if he had described man as the architect of circumstances. In the light of what he attempted at New Lanark, such is the fair interpretation to put upon his words. No man was more masterly or thorough than himself in dealing with circumstances, for, knowing how powerfully they form the character of the man that is to be, he made it the ambition of his life to surround the infant, the child, the man, by good influences, by the best

Digitized by Google

environments. He was the founder of infant schools, and was the foremost man of his day in equipping and perfecting a sound system of education. The school-rooms which he provided for his weavers' children were like picture-galleries and museums. In the work of emancipating labour and raising the status of the workers, he was the first of employers to accept the ten-hours' limit, and he often said that six hours' labour would be quite sufficient if all did their share of the work. He substituted Co-operation for private enterprise, acting from the knowledge, which proved how long-headed he was, that workmen, when they have an interest in the business by receiving part of the profits, will work better than mere wage-earners. What came of his experiments in Co-operation was told by himself in a letter to the *Times*, dated 1834: 'For twenty-nine years we did without the necessity for magistrates or lawyers; without a single legal punishment; without any known poor's rate; without intemperance or religious animosities. We reduced the hours of labour, well educated the children from infancy, greatly improved the condition of adults, diminished their daily hours of labour, paid interest of capital, and cleared upwards of £300,000 of profit.' It is now too late in the day to disown Robert Owen and his works, or to think of affixing the mark of secularism to his name. The curious phenomenon of history is to have overlooked so long what may be called the secular interest of Christ's teaching and example. There were versions of Christianity in Owen's day which of set purpose opposed secular movements of reform—versions so hard and narrow, so super-theological and anti-social, that Christ Himself must have opposed them with every word and act of His life, while Owen's version, without the name, must have been infinitely preferred. Happily, we have come to a time when the secular can be viewed as the divinest part of the sacred, and provision for the wants of man can be accepted as the highest homage paid to God, and fulfilment of duties nearest to the wants of common day entitle a man to be called 'great in the kingdom of heaven.' Co-operation is no longer treated as

Digitized by Google

secularism; Chartism is no longer judged to have been 'synonymous with devil-worship.' As we study the social evolution of humanity—the abolition of slavery, the elevation of woman, the broadening of liberty, the emancipation of labour, and the spread of such movements,—what are they all but great strides in the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth?

The much-improved circumstances of the people in our land to-day are due in a great measure to the labours of Robert Owen, who, while he lived, had friends in the courts and highest circles of Europe, and now lies in an almost forgotten grave near his birthplace in Wales. Co-operation as it was advocated and advanced by one who may be called its pioneer and apostle needs to be distinguished from later phases of the movement. It is a word that vaguely covers many forms of concerted effort. When Owen, as editor of the *Economist*, announced, in 1821, 'The Secret is Out: it is unrestrained Co-operation, on the part of All the members, for Every purpose of social life,' it evidently described nothing less magnificent than Communism for the whole of society. Bishop Lightfoot told the co-operators of 1880, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, that 'the habit of providence and the habit of association may be said to be the two pillars of civilisation. Co-operation is founded on these two principles, and thus it is a civilising influence of the highest kind. Providence is its lesson and association its school.' With Owen it was rather a series of novel experiments on the principle of association than a lesson in the habit of providence, as it afterwards became. But the spirit of Co-operation was from the beginning religious, altruistic, and Christian. In the social sphere it was an all-embracing scheme for making worthier and better life among fellow-citizens; in the economic sphere it was a principle of fellowship, of brotherhood, a high ideal of freedom and honest industry among workers. If Owen had been anxious to conciliate the religious, he might have culled many a text of Scripture from which to commend the Co-operative Gospel. 'Am I my brother's keeper?' —he might have met the anti-social with that saying of Cain;

Digitized by Google

or he might have quoted the fine words of the prophet, 'They helped everyone his neighbour, and everyone said to his brother, Be of good courage'; or he might have displayed a banner with the golden rule, 'Do to others as you would have them do to you.'

About the time when Owen's social teachings ceased to charm, when his romantic pictures of Communistic life began to fade, and his projects of Labour Exchanges became bywords, and his grand hopes of Industrial Co-operation melted like soap-bubbles into thin air, the movement took form and heart once more in a quiet town of Lancashire—the town of Rochdale, which co-operators of the present day regard as the Bethlehem of their gospel. In the year 1844, twenty-eight artisans of that town, at the suggestion of one of them, Mr. Howarth, opened a store in a little dingy room of Toad Lane for the sale of groceries, on the principle of a division of profits according to purchases, each purchaser requiring to be a member of the store and to subscribe a portion of the capital, for which a fixed interest was to be allowed. Co-operative stores did not originate in Rochdale—more than two hundred existed in 1830, but the profits went to the capitalist, not to the customers; nor was the Toad Lane Store the first that paid dividend on purchases. As early as 1822 Alexander Campbell recommended the principle to the co-operative bakers of Glasgow, and advised the men of Rochdale to attempt it in their new undertaking; while a society at Meltham Mills, near Huddersfield, started in 1827, and continued for forty-three years to divide profits on purchases. But the twenty-eight weavers of Rochdale, who began their store with humble instalments of twopence a week, till they collected a capital of £28, fairly committed themselves to the principle of dividend on purchases, took the name of Equitable Pioneers, became propagandists of their idea, and lived to make it one of the most important social movements of our century. The story of the 'Famous Twenty-Eight' old Pioneers does not need to be told again. It is enough to observe, as we pass on, that custom, religion, and ignorance combined to oppose their

Digitized by Google

efforts; and even Robert Owen, the original champion of Co-operation, could not refrain from a mild contempt for the 'twenty-eight' Equitable Pioneers, as he saw his grand idea reduced by them to what he thought was a sordid and shabby kind of shopkeeping. 'Joint-retailing,' he said in later life, 'is not the social system which we contemplate.' But apart from the credit due to the Rochdale Pioneers for putting the system of co-operative distribution on what they held to be a sound and equitable basis, they were not wanting in the higher motives and aims which influenced men like Owen. One of the principles formulated in 1832 they adopted in 1844, viz., 'That as soon as practicable the society shall proceed to arrange the powers of production, distribution, education, and government, or, in other words, to establish a self-supporting home colony of united interests for the common good of all.' They saw the evils of Individualism in the agglomeration of wealth, and in order to remove them saw that it was necessary for society to be based on the principle of common interest. The idea of self-employment in production, as well as the idea of self-management in distribution, was evidently struggling in their mind towards the light—the motive by which they were actuated was to mitigate the harshness of competition and secure better conditions of labour; while Co-operation was the central idea, the driving wheel, by means of which they believed that workmen could obtain a fair share of the produce of labour and an economic independence. The stores were to act as a sort of stepping-stone to the attainment of such desirable results. By a right management of them, it was thought that wealth might be made and capital accumulated, and the means thus be gained to begin the emancipation of labour.

How far has this idea of the Rochdale co-operators been realised? The Toad Lane Store opened with a stock-in-trade which might have been conveyed to it in a wheelbarrow, and goods were sold about two nights in the week and for two hours each night; the weekly receipts during the first fortnight of the society's operations did not average £10, and the two

Digitized by Google

pioneers, Ashworth and Cooper, had the honour of selling as the first two unpaid shopkeepers. By such services the store was kept open till it weathered the storms of neglect and opposition, and met with favour. Much has been said, and rightly said, about the difficulties which this undertaking had to surmount, but a number of circumstances favoured its inception. The Forties of this century were signalised by epoch-making events in the annals of labour. The first co-operative store, humble and obscure, was opened in 1844; the Corn Laws were repealed in 1846; and the famous Ten Hours Act was passed in 1847. Under the influence of these changes, the co-operative movement began to march with giant strides, so that twelve years after the weekly sale of goods amounting to £10 rose to £4822. In 1862 there were 450 societies with a membership of 90,000; the annual sales were £2,350,000; the profits amounted to £166,000; and the societies accumulated a share and loan capital of £450,000. In the next twenty years the progress is still more remarkable, for the sales have risen to £225,000,000, and the profits to about £18,000,000, saved for working men by working men. At the present date, 1893, the total number of distributive and productive associations is 1624, with a membership of 1,750,000, with a turnover exceeding £50,000,000, with a net profit of £5,000,000, and with an aggregate capital of £12,000,000. These millions of the co-operative budget are an ample vindication of its policy. Such facts as these indicate marvellous developments of co-operation, and far exceed the expectations of the Toad Lane 'dreamer of dreams'; they tell one of the most glorious chapters in the history of social and industrial improvement among the working classes. Fifty years ago they were told to take in their own hands matters which directly affect their well-being; they have made this their main principle as co-operators, and have done the business of middlemen to their own profit with unquestionable ability and success. Co-operation for the distribution of commodities, on the principle of a division of benefits among consumers, has been fifty years

Digitized by Google

on trial, and has effected such enormous economies for the labouring classes that the movement has evidently come to stay, and is likely to grow in strength. Co-operation adopts methods that are acknowledged by impartial students to be perfectly legitimate. On the ground of liberty, co-operators may work together to improve their position financially and socially; while, from a religious point of view, the progress and success of co-operation may be taken as an object-lesson to prove that each man's happiness consists in the happiness of all others. It is a Christian duty for everyone to 'help his neighbour, and say to his brother, Be of good courage.' The movement is based on brotherhood and co-operation; it aims at benefiting not one person, or a few, in particular, but the general body of its membership. It does not ignore self-interest, while it combines for the common good. 'Every man for every man, himself included,' is a proverb which not ineptly describes it. It admits of nothing in the shape of patronage or charity. While it is an equitable association for the whole, it preserves individuality, and helps every man to help himself.

What are the advantages of the Co-operative Movement? In the half-century that has passed, co-operators have shown how much men may advance, how many benefits they may gain, by combination and their own efforts; what great things may be wrought simply by making common interests equal all round. The Co-operative Movement is designed to promote industry and thrift. What economies it has effected, the figures given make plain to us. Millions have been saved and gained by it. By effecting those great economies, it thereby increases the wealth of the labouring classes, gives them the profits of Capital as well as Labour, and imbues them with the sentiment and sense of capitalists. Co-operators do not feel, like Trade Unionists, a sense of antagonism to Capital. The success of industrial co-operation is a triumph of thrift, of honesty, and of educated common sense. Let us see how it encourages thrift, and what benefits are thus conferred.

The method of dealing is that of ready money only, and by

Digitized by Google

the strict observance of this rule Co-operation has taught the advantage of cash payments over credit. The tendency of getting into debt is an evil of such dimensions that some who have gauged its mischief do not hesitate to say that it is 'only second in its demoralising influence to the drinking customs of the people.' The demon of debt has slowly but surely crushed many a working man and woman, and reduced them to a kind of serfdom. In the co-operative store there are no bad debts, pure food at market prices is obtained, and the difference between shop prices and the actual cost of articles is returned every quarter as dividend, or invested at five per cent. in the funds of the society. The dividend amounts to an average of half-a-crown in the pound, which yields about £5 a year. In many families purchases at the store will give double that amount. In this way a man's wages may be raised two or three shillings per week without a strike, or he may get back at the end of half a year as much as will pay house rent for a year. The store becomes a savings bank, and it is a wise policy not to draw the dividend, but let it accumulate, as not a few do till it amounts to £200, the largest sum permissible. A great deal is said about old age pensions, and statesmen propose that after forty years' saving a sum of five shillings a week be allowed to keep people out of the workhouse. Double that allowance could be obtained from the profits of co-operation. Take the average dividend of £5 per annum, capitalise it with interest for forty years, and it would bring in more than ten shillings a week to keep the aged in comfort to the close of life. This device of profits to purchasers is such a stroke of economical genius that a true co-operator not only eats his cake, and has it still, but eats and clothes himself into a modest competency. In the opinion of a certain class, Co-operation is not based on any divine principle of brotherhood and unity of interests, but on extreme selfishness, because it violates the good rule of 'Live and let live,' and threatens to absorb the distributive trade of the country. The success of the movement has attracted a great deal of opposition. We are

Digitized by Google

reminded by it of the distress which frequently happens from new inventions throwing certain classes out of employment. There is truth, however, in the saying of Earl Rosebery that 'Co-operation will never put an end to shopkeepers, and shopkeepers will never put an end to Co-operation.' Although sanguine co-operators dream of the federation of stores and wholesales becoming some day the universal distributor, it must be remembered that absolute barriers are set to the extension of this system, and that large areas of industrial operations for consumption lie beyond the reach of mere voluntary association. It is also well known that able shopkeepers, with the advantages of single management and some capital, and specially acting on the ready-money principle, are quite able not only to look after themselves, but to make rapid and large profits. Shopkeepers would be wise if they ceased to denounce it, and dealt with it rather as an accomplished fact, and learned of it how to put their business on a sounder basis. They should put it on a cash footing, and strive to exterminate the evils of debt. They should likewise consider the effect of long hours on shop assistants, who have to work fourteen or fifteen hours a day. Shops ought not to be open more than ten hours a day, and with a half-holiday for the working classes on Saturday no necessity exists for keeping them open till midnight. The employés of the store have shorter hours and a weekly half-holiday, and shut at nine or ten on Saturday night, and the employés of the shop ought to have and do the same. A million people are engaged in the retail distribution of goods, and they should have more time for self-improvement, recreation, and family life. They have no organisation to help them in securing better arrangements. Voluntary combination cannot do so, for one cantankerous fellow bent on his selfish interests can upset any arrangements agreed upon by everybody else. The only remedy must, therefore, be found in legislation.

The co-operative method of joining to make profits from cheap purchases has received the approbation of the highest authorities. In 1864 Earl Derby, at the opening of a store

Digitized by Google

in Prestwich, said: 'The Co-operative Movement has always appeared to me to be well calculated to encourage in the operative classes habits of frugality, temperance, and self-dependence'; and in 1877 Mr. Gladstone said: 'I cannot say what I think of the value of it. I hope it will extend to other things which it has scarcely yet touched.'

Notwithstanding the magic power of 'dividend on purchase,' and perhaps just on account of it, the movement is not free from serious perils. The sordidness that is begotten of success may taint its membership and obscure its early ideals. As an instrument of material salvation for the working classes, as a means of profitably spending their wages, the Co-operative method rests on a sound basis, and should not be despised; but the encomiums it draws forth from statesmen and friends of reform have reference principally to its ideal or religious side, to the means it possesses of cultivating independence and self-respect, brotherhood, and mutual help. Leaders in the co-operative commonwealth—men still aflame with love of its ideals—confess that it runs too much in the narrow rut of commercial selfishness and greed; 'there lives amongst us too much of the huxter's spirit, which finds its sweetest joy in perpetually beating down prices, and too little of the spirit of human brotherhood, that mourns over the social evils of our time, and longs to labour and to sacrifice for their removal. We think too much of cheapness, and too little of humanity.' If co-operators are simply dividend-hunters, they worship the mammon of unrighteousness; the vice of cupidity doth canker their souls. If committees of stores exist to make dividend for the sake of making it, then no matter though they point to magnificent premises of stone and lime, and have an enormous turnover, dry rot creeps over the whole concern from garret to cellar. The education side of the movement—that side which seeks rather to make men than to make money—is in danger of being sacrificed to a spirit of greed. 'I want a good big dividend first,' said a writer in the *Co-operative News*, 'then will be time to squander our profits on education.' Should that spirit

Digitized by Google

ever be in the ascendant among co-operators, the days of their movement are numbered. A religious spirit is necessary to the work of all true co-operation. The Mammon of dividend-making, and the Dagon of competition, must alike be broken in the Co-operative Temple, and Christ must teach and be worshipped and obeyed there. That men are brothers one of another because they are sons of God, and must think not of their own but of one another's wealth,—here is the salt of co-operation that can alone preserve it from corruption, and make it 'the savour of life unto life.'

The salt of Co-operation is to be found in its idealists, among those friends who, like Vansittart Neale, ever understood its aim to be the emancipation of Labour from the thraldom of Capital, and who organised a method of distribution as the path to it. They sought to give Labour control over its own fortunes by co-operating with Capital, and not lying under its dominion. Idealists though they were, and dreamers in a world where a more equitable distribution of wealth should exist, they did not wage war with Capital like their bellicose brethren, the Trades Unionists. Capital, in their eyes, was accumulated wealth, built up out of little economies till it became a mighty lever in the movements of industry. Capital may be the master, the partner, or the servant of Labour. Like fire it is a good servant but a bad master. When it is placed above Labour, it is apt to be more dangerous than chattel slavery in its worst days; and this is too much the position it holds in the present industrialism. It puts the workman in the position of a wage-earner and a hireling; it not only takes from him the lion's share of the profits, but subjects him to the tyranny of his employer. He may be dismissed if he joins a Trade Union, or ventures to have a religion or a political conviction of his own. That is a state of things which an intelligent race of workers can never regard with equanimity or submit to with contentment. Early co-operators sought deliverance from this state of things; they were convinced that Labour is prior to and above Capital, and deserves a much higher consideration. In industrial partner-

Digitized by Google

ships Capital ceases to be the master, and agrees to be the partner, of Labour. They are more or less on a level. The workman obtains over and above wages a share in the profits. But the co-operative ideal seeks to make Capital the servant of Labour, by dividing not a share but all the profits among the producers, thus making the capitalist and workman the same—Capital and Labour one. The great pioneers of Co-operation never ceased to urge this as the one ideal worthy of their aspirations; they hoped gradually and peacefully to eliminate from the industrial system all the jarring elements which, at present, divide us into 'two nations,' to terminate the conflict between Capital and Labour, and raise the masses of the nation to a more just, contented, and harmonious life.

In furtherance of this aim they began to distribute commodities on the plan of common interests. The store was a device for creating capital out of humble economies, and thus furnishing a lever with which to promote a more equitable distribution of wealth. Something even more than an economic device to save a few shillings on purchases was contemplated in the store system. Of more importance was the moral value of the movement than any cash benefits it could secure to its adherents. The community might in the long run be injured, and not profited, by a movement intent only on financial successes. To see a million or two of workmen treating high quarterly dividends as the alpha and omega of Co-operation, would have been regarded by its early advocates as a mercenary business that had degenerated to the higgling of the market.

How far, then, has the movement fulfilled its primary mission? Has it yet touched the heart of the industrial problem? Has it done anything to solve the vexed question of Labour? Let us pass from the Co-operative Store to the Co-operative Workshop—from Co-operative Distribution to Co-operative Production—for an answer.

The Co-operative body is a State within the State, representing a considerable part of the population. In such counties as Durham and Lancashire the percentage of co-operators is

Digitized by Google

respectively 30·6 and 24·2; in Clackmannan and Dumbarton it is 86·0 and 22·3. Such a body of co-operators represents a strong opinion on certain subjects, which finds expression in Congresses and Unions, and exercises great influence on the course of public affairs. It must therefore move on; it cannot stand still; it would perish of dry rot if it did. It has hold of a great and pregnant principle—that society is a brotherhood, and not a collection of warring atoms—and that principle urges it along the path of progress. It has still further a heavy amount of capital pushing it from behind. The question, 'What shall we do with our capital?' is one which now agitates the Co-operative world. Some propose to hand it back to members when it has accumulated to a certain point; others are of opinion that it should be invested in private enterprises; but as this mode abandons the Co-operative ideal of common interests, the best counsellors of the movement hold that it should be applied to Co-operation in manufacture, and so help to organise all industry, both productive and distributive, not for the special benefit of any particular individual or class, but for the equal benefit of all. It is, however, when Co-operation passes from the distributive to the productive sphere that the power of the principle, both economically and morally, encounters the severest test. Many experiments in production signalise the history of this movement, and on the whole they make up a painful chapter of accidents. To secure any measure of success in this direction, it is necessary to be possessed of ample capital, superior skill in management, and a wide and steady market. The absence of one or other of these things, and sometimes of all three, is sufficient to explain the lack of success on productive lines. The promoters of experiments were in the first days often poor men, who had not the means to establish large workshops; and as all industry was aggregating itself in such workshops, experiments on a small scale inevitably went to the wall. Even when wealthy friends of the movement, like Vansittart Neale, risked and lost their fortunes in large concerns, and placed at the head of them

Digitized by Google

marked and leading men in business, the men would either not work long enough, or quarrel among themselves, or lack the qualities of control; and so, after a short and unsatisfactory career, the schemes failed disastrously. But the years that have brought large and increasing capitals to the Distributive Stores and Wholesale Societies furnish them with the means of trying the method of Co-operation for productive purposes, and those years, while laying up ample capital, have also yielded an education not only in the elementary virtues of thrift, temperance, and independence, but likewise in the higher moral qualities of organising, managing, and presiding over commercial affairs. Add to these what we have laid down as a third requirement for successful production—the numerous stores for a sure and extensive market, and we may say that co-operators are on the threshold of new achievements in connection with their cause.

How stands the case, then, at the present time? One of the largest societies is the Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale with 10,000 members and a business exceeding £300,000 a year. In 1855 it commenced a manufacturing society on the principle of apportioning the profits made, in part to Capital and in part to Labour. Great success marked its early years, but the shareholders began to think that the workers got too much profit, and abolished the bonus to Labour. From year to year the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers have reported augmenting profits and dividends on purchase, till in December of 1889 the profits amounted to £34,000, and the dividends to £30,000, but not a single penny went to the workers employed by the society in its stores and workshops. It has always been a vital principle of the Co-operative Movement that every workman should have a share of profit, but not ten per cent. of the stores have learned yet to act upon it, and in the birthplace of the movement it has been dropped out because the rank and file must at any cost have a big dividend.

There are two wholesale societies—one in Manchester and one in Glasgow—which are federations of stores for the purpose of buying and distributing goods to the stores; and they have

Digitized by Google

buyers in all parts of the world to secure the best goods. The sales of the English Society are £4,500,000 a year, and of the Scotch society about £3,000,000. Gathering to themselves great capital, these societies have established workshops and mills for the manufacture of goods; the corn mills do a business of about £1,300,000 annually, and the other productive agencies a business of nearly £220,000. How far are they true to the principle that 'justice, not selfishness, must govern exchanges'? Take the English Wholesale. Whenever the question arises of giving to the workers in its shops and factories a part of the profits, it has been met with silence or dilatory motions. The consumers take the whole profits, and give the workers nothing but the ordinary wages of the district, and the managers and foremen fixed salaries. Co-operators in public meeting, when they hear the true principle of their movement set forth in inaugural addresses of noblemen, bishops, and other benevolent personages, hail it with vociferous cheers, and then go back to their societies to contradict it in practice.

We have better things to tell of the Scottish Wholesale. At Shieldhall, successful experiments in production have been carried on for a few years. About 2000 workmen are employed there; the work is done under the best sanitary conditions; wages are twenty per cent. above the ordinary rate; and the workers participate in the profits. In the boot factory it does a trade of more than 5000 pairs per week, turns out 20,000 tons of preserves in the same time, and in a single quarter increased £64,119 on a business already doing £3,000,000 per annum. It is also interesting to know what has been done by the Scottish Wholesale Society to put down sweating. This nefarious system is perpetrated among us by a love of bargain-hunting, which is quite as strong in other people as it is in Co-operative customers. As this society has a good command of money, it took up the trade of shirt-making, because this is the most severely sweated trade; and now it can make shirts of every kind, undersell the sweaters, give twenty per

Digitized by Google

cent. on wages to the work-people with a share of the profits, and yet have a dividend for the shareholders. If the same could be done elsewhere, sweating would die a natural death, and it would be unnecessary to resort to the dubious remedy of legislation and inspection in order to get rid of this evil.

There have been mistakes and failures in productive efforts, the tendency of which is to create misgiving and excessive caution among those societies that are called to risk their money in such ventures; there is a disposition to put profits first and principle on the shelf in the majority of stores, but the inherent vitality of the movement has survived its failures, and encourages us to believe that it will survive remaining errors and move on to new developments. Productive Co-operation has arrived at the stage reached by Co-operative Distribution twenty-five years ago, but with more of the omens of success to encourage its advance, for a hundred co-operative productive societies are successfully at work. Such an idea is full of attraction to the present age; for if it could be realised on a great scale, it would solve, without State intervention, the anomalies that exist in the relations of Capital and Labour. Great as have been the advantages of distributive organisations, they have done nothing to mitigate the competitive system by introducing some Co-operative method; they have not so much as touched the heart of the industrial problem. Co-operation has been carried forward one stage—to the store, but it must take another step and go on to the workshop for a solution of that problem. To emancipate Labour, yet at the same time to weld Capital and Labour into one, and use it for the well-being of humanity—such is the problem for our Christian civilisation. At present the larger proportion of wealth goes to Capital, and Labour gets less than its due; and not only is the labourer robbed of profit which by right belongs to him, but the enormous power of Capital subjects him to the condition of a wage-slave. He appears in the past, first as a slave and then as a serf; he appears in the present as a hireling, but early co-operators sought to make him a partner in the fruits of his toil, and

Digitized by Google

hoped in this way to secure a wider and juster diffusion of wealth. As soon as the hireling is raised to the position of a partner, an important step forward is taken on the road to the emancipation of Labour. This is the new path which Co-operation must strike out, if it is to work any deliverance, along which the eyes of its eager apostles are casting wistful glances. They are bent on applying, as far as possible, that principle of Co-operation which claims for the worker a co-partnership with Capital in the profits of industry—a principle that shall be fair to Labour and fair to Capital alike. The principle has been formulated by an eminent Frenchman, and may thus be expressed: after Capital has received fair interest, and Labour its wage, and a sufficient sum has been set apart for depreciation and reserve fund, the surplus should be divided between the capitalist and labourer in proportion to the value of their respective services. Not only did Godin, founder of the *Familistere*, formulate this principle, but he worked it out equitably in all its points. Capital had its normal interest of five per cent. Salaries were paid to labour, intelligence, and capital, and the surplus profits were divided in proportions of twenty-five per cent. to management and seventy-five per cent. to labour. After thirty years' service, members gained a retiring pension of nearly £40. During the twelve years of the *Familistere* the capital touched £122,200, Labour gained £128,440, and the retiring fund had a share of £32,520. In this business house, as well as in that of Leclaire, all the elements required for the well-being of masters and workers alike were justly and happily secured.

It is possible that such associations of labourers with capitalists may be destined to play a large and increasing part in the future industry of this country, and there can be little doubt that if they were generally established they would go far to end the chronic warfare between Capital and Labour, and bring about industrial peace.

Such a method, however, lies outside the boundaries of the present Co-operative Movement, which is wholly a movement of working men, and which, if it would try to achieve the

Digitized by Google

emancipation of labour, must adopt another form of partnership, and that an association of labourers among themselves. This kind of Co-operation it is now in some measure competent to undertake, because it has capital to be put out to use, and requisite capacity in the training of its membership for industrial enterprise, and a large market for its productions. It is the opinion of some critics that present co-operators are so intent on having good dividends that under their committees the movement is drifting farther and farther into a sort of rival shopkeeping, from which it is impossible to expect any solution of industrial problems. If this sordid spirit has got the upper hand, all progress and picturesqueness must disappear from the movement. If it does not create a type of character equal in courage, fortitude, and unselfishness to that of its pioneers, then justice for the workers in the realm of industry must be sought elsewhere. But we are persuaded that better things, and things that accompany salvation, throb in the breast of more than a million co-operators, and that they will play a first part in leading us out of the competitive wilderness, in which all nations are wandering, into the promised land of industrial peace. The Scottish Wholesale Society has already agreed to give the workers a share in the profits, and is disposed to give them a voice in the administration. It is making history by such new developments. Meanwhile, however, it must be ranked among the main hindrances to Co-operation on productive lines that a sordid love of profits still prevails in the rank and file, and that the way in which the stores treat their employés savours too much of the greedy pagan spirit which would keep the worker down to the position of a hireling, instead of the fair Christian principle which recognises the worker as entitled to a share of profits in proportion to the value of the services rendered.

Nearly allied to this hindrance is another which divides the leaders of the Co-operative Movement into two schools of thought. Some of them are so enamoured of the successes in Distributive Co-operation as to conceive that they could undertake the productive department of Labour, and carry it out

Digitized by Google

beneficially to the workers of the country, on the principle of consumption. They would make consumption, not production, the chief corner-stone of Co-operation; they would make the purchaser, and not the worker, the dominant factor in the new industrial order. A vast extension of the store system is desired, a kind of Co-operative Utopia, in which the federation of stores and the Wholesales are to combine the functions of universal provider and universal employer, and the worker shall not need to trouble himself whether the advantage come to him as a rise in wage or in dividend. The present chairman of the English Wholesale thinks that the whole trade and industry—the production, distribution, and transport of the country—should be in the hands of the Wholesale, and the profits be distributed on consumption among the whole people.

It would take us aside from our religious object to consider at any length what this 'dreamer of dreams' thinks it possible to be accomplished by some Universal Wholesale Society, based upon co-operative consumption. Let it be enough to say that the placing of control over industry in the hands of voluntary associations of consumers is economically unsound and absurd from a Christian or ethical point of view. The worker, not the consumer, becomes the chief factor in the department of manufacture. If it is said that we do not consume in order to produce, but produce in order to consume, the answer still lies beyond such distinctions; for we live neither to produce nor to consume, but we produce or consume in order to live—in order to live richer, fuller human lives. It is a question not of wealth, but of well-being; beyond every other consideration this is the test. The right of the worker to share in the profits of industry is supreme. It does not matter where or how the profit is made; if it is created exclusively by the people, they have a right to share it. To subordinate the interests of the producers to the interests of the consumers would be not only to ignore the fundamental divergence of those interests, but to transfer the worker from the 'absolute monarchy of capitalism to the oligarchy of joint-stockism,' drag down wages to the level of

Digitized by Google

the poorhouse, and bring about what has been termed 'the deification of the sweater.' 'To raise the producer to his true dignity,' says one of the co-operative fathers, 'we must subordinate mere consumption altogether to production. Consumption is primarily the animal element; production is divine. Man only begins to be man when he begins to produce, to develop, to spend himself in fruitful effort . . .; and the main question becomes, not whether you or I, as consumers, should buy a given article so much per pound or per yard, cheaper or dearer, but whether the men who spend themselves on the production of that article shall or shall not have the primary claim to the fruits of their labour.' Judge Hughes, one of the greatest advocates of the co-operative cause, says that if Labour is to be dealt with on the basis of wholesale production for the sole benefit of the consumer, his faith in English Co-operation is at an end. The question is one, not of economics, but of religion; not of wages and profits, but of justice and brotherhood: a question of life.

Another important stage in the progress of the Co-operative Movement is the relation it will hold in the future to Trades Unions, Productive Co-operative Societies, the Municipality, and the State. For these different bodies approach the Labour Problem from different points of view, and all are agreed that it can only be solved by a common understanding and conjoint action of the whole. The problem of workmen managing industrial enterprise so as to eliminate the profit-sharer and supersede private enterprise is one sufficiently obstinate to be beyond the power of any two or three of these united factors to deal with successfully; and even though all of them should be harnessed for this object, it is still a matter of doubt whether they will succeed in improving the wages system off the face of the earth. It is a promising sign of the times that these two great organisations of workers, the Trade Unionists and co-operators, are seeking closer alliance with one another on the ground of common interests. Although the majority of Trade Unionists belong to some store, and an equal number of

Digitized by Google

co-operators are connected with some Trade Union, yet the relations between them for a long time were anything but cordial, often bitterly antagonistic. Trade Unionists have found fault with the alleged practices of co-operative societies, because they seem to be merely stock-trading concerns on a cash basis, and in their desire for profit ignore the right of the worker, and often treat him worse than any sweating employer—because they trade in goods without caring where the stuff is made, if it secures big dividends. For that part of it, the desire for 'cheap goods' is not confined to co-operators, and it ill becomes a Trade Unionist to fling the first stone. The public—the universal consumer—is the Great Sweater, and it needs both the Trade Unions and co-operators to unite their forces in order to put down the evils of sweating. Happily the leaders of both movements see eye to eye, not only as to the social crime of buying sweated goods, but as to the need of improving the conditions of Labour and promoting its equitable reward, and for the last few years they have been trying to bring about a closer alliance. Neither movement can make good progress without the other; they should therefore come into close and cordial co-operation. Of the 40 millions of people in the United Kingdom, 12 millions are covered by the two movements, and if they agreed to work together many of our existing industrial evils would be speedily and effectually removed.

A second step must be taken to reconcile the two associations of consumers and producers. It is not necessary to allege so strongly, as some critics are in the habit of doing, that co-operative production has been a failure; and if the history of that form of the movement has not been so successful as the other, we must remember that the difficulties are immensely greater. We see now where its weakness lay in the past—in a want of capital and administrative talent, and especially in the impotence of little associations of craftsmen to cope with the vast manufacturing industries of private enterprise; but these difficulties are disappearing, and a well-founded hope prevails

Digitized by Google

that the productive phase of the movement has a greater future before it than Distributive Co-operation has achieved. Unanimity and cordial working together of the two associations must be cultivated in order to push forward Co-operation another stage. It is the duty of brethren in the co-operative faith to lay their heads together, and devise measures for federating or fusing their separate societies into some organisation that will command sufficient capital, managing ability, technical skill, and a steady market. Overlapping and competition between those societies ought not to exist. Wholesale Societies should not undertake to manufacture articles already manufactured by societies on co-operative principles, but should take their supply of goods from productive societies, always subject to the condition that such goods are of the right quality. The Scottish Wholesale, with its accustomed forwardness, has entered into such arrangements with the Selkirk Tweed, Paisley Manufacturing Societies, and a few more. On the other hand, the Productive Societies must acknowledge the right of the Wholesales to become producers, and work with them to make co-operative production a greater success. In order to secure full harmony, the two associations of consumers and producers must recognise the self-employing workshop, based on the partnership of the worker, as the best form of industry to improve the people, and the simplest way of administering productive industry for the common good.

The writer of *The Co-operative Movement in Great Britain* has done it signal service by showing its coincidence with the best aspirations of Socialists, and how the store and the municipality aim alike at representing the interests of the whole community. Co-operators are 'boiling down the Socialist Movement,' to use Lord Rosebery's phrase, and incorporating whatever is good in it. The Co-operative Movement has built up the first great form of democracy in trade—of industry without private profit, under the democratic regulation of working men. It has applied to the 'more sordid side of life that sense of public duty and that power of combined action

Digitized by Google

which make the Anglo-Saxon successful in the Municipality and the democratic State.' As, therefore, co-operative enterprise advances and the Municipality obtains by devolution new powers, those two factors working together will be able to grapple with the question of the production of wealth in the interest of the people, and to divide among the community the large amount of wealth which goes day by day into the pockets of employers. To show how this democratisation of industry might be easily and quickly effected, we have only to mention the fact that in the county of Clackmannan eighty-six per cent. of the population are co-operators. 'As the mediæval guild, in many cases, actually became a municipal corporation, so the Co-operative Society might conceivably become merged in the fully-developed local administrative unit of the future.' . . . 'Thus,' as the author referred to adds, 'the combination of co-operative industry with municipal enterprise appears by far the best solution of the current Riddle of the Sphinx, which modern society must solve or perish.' We have no desire to spin Utopias or play the rôle of a prophet, however strong our hope is for humanity. Truth may be in what political economists tell us, that in the near future there is nothing to indicate that industry will become less despotic than it now is. The captain of industry is still omnipotent, the co-operative workman is still an insignificant factor, and the enormous wealth of the country is still with the former. But the progress of education, and the advance of democracy, and, it may be, the growing domination of the wealth-monopolist, may hasten on the day when the use of capital shall be transferred to the people, and when the people shall reap the full reward of the capital which has been mainly built up by their labour.

The end we desire is not merely to win for the workers a juster share in the wealth they create, but to give them a fairer chance of living a full, rich, and wholesome life. Doubtless, it is a struggle for ampler means and more leisure they have in hand, and that struggle will not be less but more in the next

Digitized by Google

few years, but the problem is greater still. Though we arrived at something like a solid Co-operative Commonwealth in the year 2000, never let us forget that it will not long remain solid if ease and luxury are its chief end. We must aim not only at changing material conditions, but elevating the ideals of life. 'Pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness' never made a worthy commonwealth. The goal must be Justice, Brotherhood, and Bearing one another's burdens. It therefore behoves all who have read and thought about the wrongs and demands of the gathering labour-hosts to shape their righteous discontent in such a way that the revolution now working may be a peaceful reconstruction of society—a brotherhood in which Christ is all in all, and not a desolating invasion of Goths.

Digitized by Google

XV.

COMMONWEALTHS—IDEAL AND ACTUAL.

The world has always had its 'dreamers of dreams,' from Joseph downwards, and it will continue to have them so long as imagination is one of the human faculties, and there is faith upon the earth. They lift us to an ideal state of being, more perfect and blessed than the present, and fulfil to others the ministry of hope; they put new ideas into the mind of the world, and lend impulse to the spirit of progress. Man forms ideals, and welcomes the vision of 'worlds not realised,' because he is a being possessed of reason and imagination. It is good, therefore, that he should 'lift up his eyes to the hills,' and catch the purple radiance of the morning light; it is good that we should lift our eyes above the valleys, the narrowing and belittling things of life there, to the high mountain-tops of contemplation and desire; it is good to haunt the spots where earth lifts itself nearest heaven, and to gather treasure from afar. This ideal-shaping faculty becomes one of the greatest powers in a prosaic world like ours. Without ideals we cannot understand the past or anticipate the future; without them we cannot have enthusiasm, hope, or elevation of spirit. Ideals are not the worse that they cannot always be realised. If there were no castles in the air, there would be none erected on the earth. To conceive an excellent ideal helps to make our lives sublime, by creating in us a desire for the good, the true, the beautiful, and by inciting us to high and worthy endeavour; while thrice

Digitized by Google

blessed is he who, having created for himself a lofty ideal, makes it actual in any degree, even though his reward be a cross and a crown of thorns. Ideals are good alike for a State or an individual, and whether they gleam faintly or shine in splendour they make a path of light that points to the perfect day. Regarding such ideals it has been well said that 'there is a virtue flowing from them which tends to raise individuals above the common routine of society or trade, and to elevate States above the mere interests of commerce or the necessities of self-defence.'

Among the men who have created ideals by the power of imagination, in accordance with the laws of reason, Plato, the friend of Socrates and the philosopher of Greece, holds a first and foremost place. He employed his creative faculty in framing an ideal society, a perfect State, and in his *Republic*, the greatest monument of his genius, he undertook to describe an order of life removed from the experience of the times in which he lived, and of the ages of which history holds any record. The *Republic* of Plato, while professing to depict a former state of things, is the conception of a mind that 'dips into the future far as human eye can see,' and constructs a vision of what may be in the coming time. This prince of idealists takes his start from facts, while he supplements and fits them into a finer harmony. He describes a state after Hellenic models, especially after that of Sparta with its strict rule of life, its devotion to gymnastics among both sexes, and its subordination of the individual to the welfare of the community; but as he proceeds with his inquiry the Hellenic type of State fades away into one of grander and simpler outlines, such an one as does not exist anywhere on earth. 'In heaven,' Plato makes Socrates say, at the close of the Ninth Book, 'there is laid up a pattern of it, methinks, which he who desires may behold, and, beholding, may set his own house in order. But whether such an one exists or ever will exist in fact is no matter; for he will live after the manner of that city, having nothing to do with any other.' Plato's *Republic* is written in the

Digitized by Google

form of a dialogue, in which Socrates, his teacher, takes the leading part. Thrasymachus speaks of the Sophists of his time, and Glaucon and Adimantus, Plato's brothers, open the argument, state objections, and keep an eye on Socrates that he clear up everything. Throughout Socrates appears as the unwearied seeker after truth.

An inquiry concerning justice forms an introduction to the *Republic*, and one speaker after another tries to define it, but when their definitions are subjected to the Socratic method of interrogation, nothing satisfactory as to the real nature of justice can be ascertained. It is, therefore, suggested that inquiry should pass from the individual to the State. 'Let us look for justice in the State first, and when we discover it there, it will be seen in the individual.' So pleads Socrates, and, all consenting, he proceeds forthwith to construct the State. He frames a simple State, based on the primitive wants of man; and when Glaucon jestingly calls it a city of pigs, and wants a luxurious State, he allows it in the hope that such extended inquiry will give a better idea of justice and injustice. This State will need a select body of guardians, who must be strong, swift-footed, high-spirited, yet gentle, and lovers of learning. Education will furnish those qualities, and it will consist in gymnastics for the body, and music for the mind. Under the term music, Plato includes literature. His views on education are so mature and masterly that writers like Milton, Rousseau, and Goethe, do little more than follow in his wake.

The magistrates are to be chosen out of this superior class, and should be among the oldest, wisest, and most patriotic members of the body. The remainder of the guardians are called auxiliaries, who represent the courage, as the rulers represent the wisdom, of the State. A third class consists of producers, and these three classes, when rightly organised, make a perfect State. Temperance or restraint must be the virtue of all classes, diffusing itself through the whole State and cementing it into a common harmony. Besides wisdom, courage, and

Digitized by Google

temperance, another virtue is needed to give them root and permanence. Everybody is expected to mind his own business and cease from meddling in that of other people. Such is Plato's idea of justice. He then proceeds to the individual man, and finds in him three parts corresponding to the three virtues and the three classes of the State. There is in human nature a Rational part, to which Wisdom belongs; there is a Spirited part, and to it Courage is related; and there is an Appetitive part, in restraint of which Temperance appears. It is the aim of the individual to win this inward harmony, and to show it outwardly in all acts. The ideal man, therefore, like the ideal commonwealth, is to be wise, brave, temperate, and just. At this stage of the *Republic*, Socrates is about to enumerate the four forms of decline from such a State, when his interlocutors, who have noted his remark about all things in common, wish him to explain the community of women and children. He ventures to say, though it comes upon them like a splashing wave, that the sexes are equal, and should have common duties and pursuits. Therefore the women ought to have the same education as the men. He rolls in before them a second and greater wave when he teaches a community of wives, not in any spirit of licentiousness, but in accordance with lawful restrictions and religious sanctities. There is no family life; parents do not recognise their offspring; the children are brought up by the State, drilled in all the frugal habits and healthy exercises that belong to the art of war. When Socrates is pressed once and again to show that such a State is possible, he heaps at last upon his interrogators the greatest wave of all by declaring that 'until kings are philosophers, or philosophers are kings, cities will never cease from ill; no, nor the human race; nor will our ideal polity ever come into being.' Careful distinction is then made between the true and the false lover of wisdom. Philosophers, worthy of ruling the State, must love all truth and hate falsehood, be spectators of all time and all existence, be indifferent to money and not afraid of death, be just and gentle, and have well-regulated and harmonious

Digitized by Google

minds. A variety of studies is set before them, the highest of all being the study of 'the Good.' What this Good is, Socrates hesitates to inquire; but he takes up his parable of a cave, the tenants of which, as they quit its shadows, pass into an upper world of light where things are seen as they are, and on leading them out of the underground den into the light of the sun he shows by his image pure intelligence attaining to the beatific vision, not only of good, but of the Sun or Fount of Good. At length, Socrates returns to examine the different forms of government which decline from the perfect State. All conceivable polities, he says, are five in number, and correspond to five classes of individuals: they are aristocracy, timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and despotism. How the perfect commonwealth, or aristocracy, passes through the inferior sorts to the last and most degenerate form of despotism or tyranny, Plato traces out in the Eighth and Ninth Books of the *Republic*, and in the Tenth Book he closes this masterpiece of literature with a discussion on the subject of poetry—with reasons for excluding poets from a place in his commonwealth—with an intimation of his belief in immortality—and with the vision of another world. 'The idea of the State is supplemented by the revelation of a future life.'[1]

The survey of Plato's ideal State which we have now made suggests a multitude of reflections. And first as to omissions or defects. No cognisance is taken of the people or lower orders; the citizens of this Republic are a select body of king-philosophers—an aristocratic class, and all the rest are a dim population of slaves. The equality of man, as man, obtains no place in it.

Again, the subordination of the individual to society that vitiated the philosophy and practice of classical antiquity adheres to the entire conception of Plato's Commonwealth. It dominates the very plan of the work. For he begins with the State in his search after the individual. The right of each man to be treated as a moral, responsible being had not been won in Plato's day.

[1] Jowett's *Introduction to the Republic.*

Digitized by Google

An all-pervasive control was exercised by the State: it manifested a supreme regard for the community, but a slender consideration for individual liberty. A greater than Socrates had to discover the individual, and to assert the rights of every soul of man.

But the views which most of all vitiate this Commonwealth are those which Plato upholds in relation to the extinction of the Family and the community of wives. Equality of the sexes was a marvellous affirmation to make in an age when women were little more than slaves, but when he propounds a community of wives, he sinks the relations between men and women to the level of the animals, and 'the most important transaction of social life,' to quote Professor Jowett, 'he who is the idealist philosopher converts into the most brutal.' In connection with this point, he also suggests that the best offspring should be preserved, and all imperfect children should be put away into some unknown hiding-place—in a word, destroyed. We are horror-struck to find the wisest and best of men deliberately sanctioning murder, and outraging the finest feelings of humanity, yet it is even so. How different the teaching of Him who was compassionate to the weakest and humblest, and who said of the children that 'their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven'! No State in the world, however perfect, could possibly survive a practical application of such doctrines as violate the first principles of morality, and destroy the sacred ties of marriage, affection, and home. 'A loose law of marriage, beyond it concubinage in some degree sanctioned by religion, beyond that again morbid vice. Such was the condition of that Greek world. What Christian marriage, in harmonious action with man's true nature, has done to counteract this condition, that Plato tried to do by a somewhat forced legislation, which was altogether out of harmony with the facts of man's nature.'[1] There are merits, however, in the *Republic* that have won the admiration of posterity.

Plato deplores the extremes of wealth and poverty as causes

[1] *Plato and Platonism*, Walter Pater.

Digitized by Google

of deterioration in the State; he would give the citizens neither the one nor the other, for the one is the parent of luxury and indolence, and the other of meanness and viciousness, and both of discontent. He maintains that where the whole State is growing up in a noble order all classes will receive the proportion of happiness which nature allows to them.

The philosopher's ideas of education have always been accounted to be of immense and inexhaustible value. He enters into the minutest particulars as to the education of youth, and points out that the child should be instructed first in the simple religious truths that God is true and God is good; next in simple moral truths; and gradually in good manners. Education should aim at symmetrical development of body and mind. It is further urged that education should proceed through the whole of life. In the pursuit of knowledge there should ever be a conviction of something still beyond. All the lines of science, and even the truths of mathematics, ought to converge on the idea of good. One should be so rapt in the contemplation of the good that he will give to it a lifetime on earth, and hope to resume it when life begins in another world.

As to Plato's doctrine of the community of property, some will count it a merit, others a defect. Without deciding on this point, we observe that excessive inequality was a greater evil in ancient than in recent times, and Plato, seeing how it divided the Greek States into two hostile peoples, sought unity in a community of goods. Aristotle, his pupil, who objected to the doctrine on the ground that it would lessen the force of individual interest as an incentive to work, yet admits that inequality is the cause of all revolutions, and wisely says that 'a State, according to the wish of Nature, should be composed of elements which approach as near as possible to equality.' On the other hand, the sacredness of private property did not command such reverence in ancient as in modern times, and neither Plato nor Aristotle believed in it as men do nowadays. The State could interfere with the right of personal property when it was deemed expedient for the public good. Questions

Digitized by Google

as to the distribution of wealth inevitably beat against the common notions of property, and push Plato's counsel of perfection once more to the front. When the masses of mankind are educated enough to perceive that the extremes of wealth and poverty become a peril to civilisation, and that wealth has ceased to be common wealth, the transition to new forms of common property is at hand. As Professor Jowett says: 'There may come a time when the saying, "Have I not a right to do what I will with my own?" may appear to be a barbarous relic of individualism; when the possession of a part may be a greater blessing to each and all than the possession of the whole is now to anyone.'

Plato has had many imitators, as the history of literature demonstrates, and the fertility and splendour of his philosophical dream may be found not only in what the writers of other ideal Commonwealths have derived from it, but in the joy of elevated thoughts which it has given to statesmen, reformers, and thinkers of all time. He is the prophet of the future, and all the prophets that come after him borrow largely from him, while none of them rise to the sublimity of thought and style manifest in his work. Somewhat near his time, though with three or four centuries between, Cicero in his *De Republica*, and Plutarch in his *Life of Lycurgus*, undertook to paint ideal States. In Cicero's work there is no originality; he derives his views of language, number, and the drama from the Greek idealist, and takes from him word for word the picture of democracy. Plato is a man of light who leads; Cicero is a man of words who orates. Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus* is the most famous of his writings, and it is valuable as the picture of a perfect Spartan State; it records answers of Lycurgus in fine laconic fashion, such as: 'How shall we best guard against the invasion of an enemy?' 'By continuing poor, and not desiring in your possessions to be one above another.' And to the question, whether they should enclose Sparta with walls: 'That city is well fortified which has a wall of men instead of brick.' To the gymnastic of the *Republic*, however, and other teachings,

Digitized by Google

Plutarch is mainly indebted in describing the ideal State of Lycurgus.

Sir Thomas More wrote *Utopia* about the year 1515, when he was about thirty-four years of age—a few years after Columbus and the Florentine Amerigo had discovered another continent—a time when men's imaginations were kindled with visions of new worlds. A world of greater splendour had also been revealed to inquiring minds in translations of Greek literature; and the young farmer of Chelsea, all aglow with Plato's ideals, and stirred by larger views of the world, conceived an ideal island across the sea, an Elysian land flowing with milk and honey, and called it the 'Place of Well-being' or Utopia. The conception of More is full of genius, dramatic skill, and refined wit. His ideal island is divided into town and country, and so arranged that the advantages of both are secured. Husbandry is the chief occupation, but every person learns some handicraft. The working day is fixed at six hours, and the rest of the day is given up to social intercourse, healthful games, music, and, most of all, to the improvement of the mind. A working day of only six hours is found to be sufficient, because everybody works except the aged, the sick, the learned, and the magistrates, and because the necessaries of life only, such as clothing and housing, are produced. With exquisite wit and delightful home-thrust at the evils of his time, he shows how, if everybody did simple work, there would be enough for all. 'Consider how great a part of all other nations is quite idle. First, women generally do little, who are the half of mankind; and if some few women are diligent, their husbands are idle. Then consider the great company of the idle priests and of those that are called religious men; add to these all the rich men, chiefly those that have estates in land, who are called noblemen and gentlemen, together with their families, made up of idle persons that do nothing but go swaggering about. Reckon in with these all those strong and lusty beggars that go about pretending some disease in excuse for their begging; and upon the whole account you will find that the number of those by whose labours man-

Digitized by Google

kind is supplied is much less than you did perhaps imagine. Then consider how few of those that work are employed in labours that men do really need; for we, who measure all things by money, give occasion to many trades that are both vain and superfluous, and that serve only to support riot and luxury. . . . If all those who labour about useless things were set to more profitable trades, and if all that number that languish out their life in sloth and idleness, of whom every one consumes as much as any two of the men that are at work do, were forced to labour, you may easily imagine that a small proportion of time would serve for doing all that is either necessary, profitable, or pleasant to mankind.' All the produce belongs to a common stock, and no one may appropriate more than another. In Utopia the citizens do not undertake the harder kind of labour, but impose it on slaves, who are not bought, however, in any market, but consist of such as have been guilty of heinous crimes. The Utopians institute all things in common, and More represents them as looking favourably on Christian teaching, because Christ and His disciples seemed to live by the rule of a community of goods. 'These things, I say, when I consider with myself, I hold well with Plato, and do nothing marvel that he would make no laws for them that refused those laws, whereby all men should have and enjoy equal portions of riches and commodities. For the wise man did easily foresee this to be the one and only way to the wealth of a community, if equality of all things should be brought in and established.' More saw the terrible inequalities of his time, in which a few enjoyed wealth and profusion, while the mass of the people led a life little better than the beasts. In keeping with the institution of all things common, the citizens of Utopia had little use for gold and silver, and prefer iron to either of them. 'They wonder much to hear that gold, which in itself is so useless a thing, should be everywhere so much esteemed that even men, for whom it was made and by whom it has its value, should yet be thought of less value than this metal.' By such keen strokes as this did More expose the

Digitized by Google

passion for gold that carried adventurers in his day across to the New World. In the Utopia, as in the Republic, religion holds a prominent place. If a man believes that chance is lord of the world, or that the soul perishes with the body, he is not fit to be citizen of a well-ordered commonwealth, and cannot be raised to honours or offices: yet the utmost toleration exists, because a man cannot make himself believe anything he pleases. The Utopians, while living a simple life, have beautiful houses, streets, and gardens, and abound in all harmless pleasures. They are not total abstainers, but are as near to being so as possible, for they have no public-houses, though they drink wine and cider. The later Malthusian question of population was likewise anticipated and solved in Utopia. The people are well distributed through town and country; a limit is set to their increase, and when that limit is reached a colony is planted in the nearest available country.

This rapid survey of More's ideal Commonwealth is enough to let us see that he had the gift beyond others of discerning the evils of his time and of divining remedies. Political and social questions have arisen that give fresh meaning to his thoughts. Never can his work lose its interest so long as that miserable life of joyless and hopeless labour remains with us, so long as the passion for private gain is so immoderately pursued. More sets his perfect State to the ideal, not of wealth, but of well-being—to the most of the best work, which is made tributary to the common good. In his remedy for over-population, he forecasts that which our nineteenth-century prophet, Carlyle, desired: 'Let there be an *Emigration Service*, . . . so that every honest willing workman who found England too strait, and the organisation of labour incomplete, might find a bridge to carry him to western lands. . . . Our little isle has grown too narrow for us, but the world is wide enough yet for another six thousand years.'

Other ideal Commonwealths, such as Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Harrington's *Oceana*, and Campanella's *City of the Sun*, can only receive a passing reference. The first and third,

Digitized by Google

written in 1629 and 1623, delineate the rising power of Science. Bacon sets it forth with much ingenuity as the civiliser that is destined to unite men in a prosperous community, and fill them with reverence for the Maker of all things. Campanella, an Italian patriot, urges the study of Nature, and requires the chief-magistrate, whom he calls the Sun, to pass a strict examination in science before being elected to office. He also borrows from Plato the community of women and goods. Neither of these works approaches the *Republic* or *Utopia* in imaginative force, in wit, or in picturesque detail. Harrington wrote his *Oceana* in 1656, and dedicated it to Cromwell, who is called Lord Archon, and archly represented as he ought to be. Hume pronounces *Oceana* to be 'the most valuable model of a commonwealth which has been offered to the public.'

There is no writing of importance on ideal polities, after Harrington, till we come to our own time. We live in an age that is rife with attempts to frame a perfect State, and poets and social reformers, with varying fitness for the task, undertake to paint ideal Commonwealths. Those literary adventures differ considerably from anything which has gone before. Previous writers imagined their communities to have dwelt in their own country thousands of years ago, or have placed them in contemporary but distant islands, but present-day writers transfer them to the future, and tell us what will be a century or two hence. The prophetic romance is a well-known feature of the literature of to-day. It is also propagandist and bent upon being realised, whereas the old creators questioned if their ideals could ever be realised, and left them to posterity as counsels of perfection. Again, the subject-matter of these creations differs with the changing times. Plato looked in his Republic for the Able man, the Wise man, as guardian and guide of the State; he looked for the attainment of a true Aristocracy, or Government of the Best, and despised democracy and handicraft. More dealt in his *Utopia* with the mercantile power and its dreams of gold, stirred by the discovery of the New World; but modern writers are face to face with a power-

Digitized by Google

ful industrial system, and with the vast improvements of an educated yet discontented democracy. This is the grey, murky background on which they paint their ideal Commonwealths. Of these latest specimens three demand brief notice—American, Bellamy's *Looking Backward*; English, Morris's *News from Nowhere*; and Austrian, Hertzka's *Freeland*. They are Socialist novels, and assume that all sin and crime, all unhappiness and misery, are traceable in the main to our existing institutions, and propose to replace these institutions by ideal arrangements that will sweep away the commercial and competitive system, with its mischievous accompaniments of money and exchange, buying and selling, and will introduce a new order in which industry and society work together for the good of all.

Bellamy's *Looking Backward* is a picture of the future, drawn by an American who has all the smartness of his countrymen, a strong liking for paradox, and a fair degree of constructive imagination. The view which he gives of society is that of a formidable industrial machine, organised on the pattern of the German army, with foremen in the place of sergeants, captains, and generals.

The Bostonian of the year 2000 sits on his housetop in an easy-chair, and sees a city of magnificent material prosperity beneath and around him; not the shabby affair it was in the days of general poverty and private wealth, because surplus wealth goes now to the adornment of the city, which all enjoy in equal degree. Industry is organised into a great army, and the workers are divided into four classes—the common labourers, the apprentices, the full workers, and the officers; and the last two are graded and advanced as they grow in skill. Under this State organisation of labour, all industries are carried on by great bodies of men, every shop and farm being equal to a hundred of ours, and the superintendent of each is like a colonel in the army. All who do their best are equally deserving, and any man able to do his duty, but persistently refusing, is cut off from all society. The conduct of business by large aggregations of capital in the hands of private and irresponsible syndicates

Digitized by Google

has passed by a natural process of evolution to the nation, making it sole employer in the common interest, and thus opening a golden future to humanity. At the age of twenty-one workers are mustered into the industrial service, and at the age of forty-five they are honourably mustered out. There is an equality of goods and comforts, there is no individual property, no money, and therefore no necessity for law, and no temptation to crime. The common stock of goods is replenished from a fertilising stream of labour, carefully regulated for the common good, so that plenty replaces poverty, and the last vestige of the serfdom of man to man disappears from earth.

Such is Bellamy's Social Utopia. This structural change in society is not sought by revolutionary but by constitutional and evolutionary methods; only the twentieth, or even the thirtieth century, may not see it, and the British and American Commonwealths, before then, may have toppled to ruin. It is a poor ideal, when closely examined; it has not wings. There is nothing in it of nature or the supernatural; nothing of the country, of mountain and meadow and stream; nothing of privacy or individuality in its pictured life; nothing to soar in — no wide horizon or infinite azure, no religion, art, or literature to idealise and spiritualise it. The ideal is too industrial — too materialistic, presenting a huge city where everybody is comfortable and terribly dull, and warranting the protest of a critic, that if he were allowed to choose as a place of residence between hell and such a city he would choose the former without hesitation.

William Morris, on the other hand, depicts a different kind of Utopia in his *News from Nowhere*. He is a poet, with a poet's dislike of organisation. Plans for nationalising public, and for municipalising local, services are not at all to his mind. His system is simplicity itself, for he would leave the methods of production and distribution of labour, and reaping its rewards, to adjust themselves. The state of life which his dreamer finds in the twenty-first century is founded on a system of equality and Communism, in which the sacred rights of

Digitized by Google

property are no more, and with the disappearance of private property there are no law courts connected with divorce or crime; money is not used, because there is no buying and selling, and all things are in common. In a chapter of twelve lines concerning politics this line is the principal one—we are 'very well off as to politics, because we have none.' Parliament House is turned into a Dung Market, and as for religion its sanctuaries are turned into Dining Saloons. Commercialism and machinery disappear, and handicraft returns. All work, and count it a pleasure; production keeps a natural and easy pace with consumption; and many things which used to be produced—'slave-wares for the poor and mere wealth-wasting wares for the rich'—cease to be made. An exodus of people from town to country rectifies matters. 'People flocked into the country villages, and flung themselves upon the freed land like a wild beast upon its prey; and in a very little time the villages of England were more populous than they had been since the fourteenth century.' With the tendency to centralisation reversed, and the pretension dropped long ago of our being the workshop of the world, all the country arts and pleasures of life return with enhanced beauty to make a free, healthy, contented, and happy people. 'Like the mediævals, we like everything trim and clean and orderly and bright; as people always do when they have any sense of architectural power.' There are no coagulated centres of population. London exists, but has largely melted away into the country; Manchester is wiped out of existence; there are no slums—what were, vanish into the gardens or green fields they too long marred. 'The population is pretty much the same as it was at the end of the nineteenth century; we have spread it, that is all.' Human life is placed in the midst of scenes where Nature answers kindness with bounty, where wide meadows under the hills are intersected with pure streams, and everything smells deliciously of hayfields and enamelling flowers. It is an earthly paradise without any need of a God or heaven. How is this Garden of Eden in the twenty-first

Digitized by Google

century ushered in? By what is called the Great Change—history knows one called the French Revolution—in which the workman and the gentleman come to close quarters, and between them destroy commercialism. The workers, having learned how to combine and what power thus passed into their hands, insist on having the management of the whole natural resources of the country, together with the machinery for using them, and reducing the privileged classes to the position of pensioners. After a civil war, and some sharpshooting right and left, the demands of the combined workers are carried, and thereupon the miserable system of life with its competition, commercialism, and machinery, tumbles to pieces, and a communal life of free and equal conditions comes into existence.

Such is Morris's imaginative Commonwealth. His Arcadian villagers of the twenty-first century differ from Bellamy's Bostonians of the preceding century, and do not live on such a dull level of utilitarian comfort, but they have secured the common ownership of land and capital, with all its accompanying benefits. These two socialist dreamers also differ about the functions of the State. Bellamy's improvements come from State Socialism, but Morris will have none of it in his perfect community. The State may prove the hardest of taskmasters and use its power to enslave the people. He advocates 'the Man versus the State,' as Herbert Spencer puts it, or as he says, 'the whole people is our parliament.' Both alike suppress human nature; they eliminate too much; they forget the most refractory element of all, human nature itself, which, unless it experience the great change, will not only fail to create, but will be sure to destroy, the fairest order of life which it is possible to conceive.

Hertzka's *Freeland* is a third ideal Commonwealth of our day, which deserves to be noticed, because it is one of the most able of recent Utopias, and comes from one of the most competent writers in an exceedingly brilliant group of Austrian economists. It pursues a middle course between Individualism with its unrestricted competition and Socialism with its absolute collective

Digitized by Google

control. Land and capital, in his estimation, ought to be State property, and should be lent to individuals or companies for productive and other purposes. The land is free, and remains the inalienable possession of the community; the capital, when its value comes back to the State, remains the possession of those who borrowed it. Capital can be repaid by instalments, and a tax for State expenses can be determined by a percentage on the net produce of labour. Since capital is so easily borrowed from the State, no one needs to work for another for a less sum than he can earn for himself with the use of free land, though he is quite free to do the one or the other. With such facilities the workers range themselves into agricultural and industrial groups, and hold the place of partners. In this way the utmost individual freedom prevails, consistent with the freedom of other individuals, while the principle of association is at the same time brought into free play. New inventions of machinery rapidly multiply so as to save labour, and reduce the time of labour without reducing what is earned. Social capital accumulates as rapidly as private capital, in the form of handsome buildings, spacious parks, and magnificent libraries. There is great social wealth along with ample individual freedom and comfort. Hertzka attributes the evils of over-production and under-consumption to our current system of commerce, and holds that so long as rent, interest, profit, and wages exist on their present footing, the labourer cannot have a fair standard of remuneration. He sees our existing society involved in a vicious circle, and looks for a new society on a soil uncorrupted by civilisation. He, therefore, carries his Freeland to a track of country in Eastern Equatorial Africa, and begins the experiment with a band of 200 picked pioneers who introduce all sorts of improvements in agriculture and machinery. With the influx of colonists, Freeland develops into a great and prosperous State. All this, and much more, the author unfolds with genuine economic learning, and with a literary grace that gives it a high place among efforts of the scientific imagination. It is worthy of note that since *Freeland* was published, a scheme

Digitized by Google

on the lines which it lays down has been initiated for planting a great colony in the Highlands of Equatorial Africa, and local committees in various parts of Austria and Germany have been formed to carry it out. Since the work was translated into English, a British Freeland Association has been formed to promote the scheme.

Before we pass away from these dreams of a reconstructed society, the observation may be made that wherever men fashion their Utopias, history disappoints by some worse actual. Plato's *Republic* came just before the vanishment of that bright Athenian life which excites the admiration of students and artists. Augustine's *City of God* was a prelude to the great rupture that cleft Christianity into East and West. The *Utopia* and *Oceana* were published, one on the eve and the other in the midst of changes that rent English society in twain. Our own abundant Utopias spring from the prevalence of disorder and anarchy, disease and misery, which may lead to dangerous upheavals in the near future. Therefore men dream those dreams, and form those ideals, in our own time more than any other, and believe in them sometimes to the exclusion of all other thought. How far, then, has any attempt been made to organise society according to the ideals now examined by us? That society may organise itself by a slow and multiform evolution into some kind of life which Plato, More, or Morris have dreamt of, all of us are fain to cherish the hope, but we desire to know if there have been any social experiments to justify the hopes which these writers inspire. Leaders of reform, such as Fourier and Owen, have undertaken to reconstruct society, and the result of their efforts shows how far it is possible to realise their systems on any large scale. Fourier held that attractions and repulsions are the governing forces of all nature, which God has distributed for the happiness of His creatures, that the desires of men, if allowed free scope, will produce the greatest happiness, and that association will favour its development; and he founded phalanxes or phalansteries of 400 families to live in one edifice, surrounded by a large and

Digitized by Google

well-cultivated domain, and furnished with workshops, and all the appliances of industry as well as all the means of recreation. Health, peace, and happiness were guaranteed to the poorest member of the Association. About half a million of pounds is said to have been spent in establishing a phalanstery at Rambouillet. Many attempts have been made — some in France and more in America—to carry Fourier's scheme into practical effect; and could it have been realised nobody would have known the earth again, but every attempt was on a small scale, with inadequate means, and therefore it resulted in failure. Fourier himself died, broken-hearted, at the disappointment of his grand and gracious dreams.

Robert Owen was the first of our countrymen to adopt the system of Communism, and try its practical realisation. Believing that any character from the best to the worst may be given to any community, and that where all things are in common the principle of selfishness would cease to exist, he commenced an organisation in the year 1825, at Orbiston, in Lanarkshire, and proved his faith in the scheme of parallelograms, as he called them, by sinking a large fortune in an attempt to build one. The Orbiston community had an estate of 290 acres, which cost £20,000, and the same amount was laid out on a parallelogram, which, however commodious, did not conform to William Morris's artistic tastes. About 200 people flocked to the spot, and tradition hath it that they were as ill-assorted a collection of persons as could be brought together beneath the same roof, whose eccentricities led the neighbours into the irreverence of calling the place Babylon. The parallelogram was soon deserted, and at its breaking up the land and buildings were sold for £16,000. In 1843 Owen tried another community, which he named Harmony Hall, in Hampshire, and many years were devoted by his followers to mature it, and make it successful. A widespread organisation existed to promote it. Two farms of more than 530 acres were rented; buildings of a pleasant semi-baronial structure, that William Morris could look upon, were erected; Owen was appointed

Digitized by Google

'President of the Congress,' and had on the outside of the chief hall the mystic letters C. M., which meant Commencement of the Millennium. But the Millennium did not begin just then. People approved of community of goods, especially when it was other people's goods, and were glad to practise their belief. With a certain grandeur of aim, which never forsook Robert Owen, he adopted a scale of administration which soon put the funds to a severe test, and he thought to avoid financial embarrassments by inventing preference shares and multiplying loanholders. As one says, 'Credit was the agreeable but insidious cankerworm which ate up Harmony.' In a year or two the Harmony experiment, after spending £37,000, passed away for ever as a communistic scheme.

Owen had other opportunities of carrying out his speculations, especially in America, where Communism is still practised by the Shakers and similar bodies, under some form of religious belief or unbelief. It is not necessary to dwell on the causes of failure with respect to these social experiments. Manifestly they had not enough of means to go on for a few years, until members could be trained to self-supporting efficiency, and in particular the members were not picked men and women of such quality as to ensure anything like success. It is true of all schemes that they have been attempted many times before they succeeded, and it remains among the doubtful things of social reform whether any number of attempts, such as those of Fourier, Owen, and the American communities, will prepare the way for trying their scheme of life on a national scale.

The fulfilment of an ideal Commonwealth must be looked for in the institutions of the State, in the machinery of government, in the growth of moral sentiments, in the development of public spirit, in the possession and practice of citizenship, and in the due subordination of personal aims among all classes to the common good. Who of us does not at once own that, where such things prevail, an ideal must be hovering in heavenly purity over the State, and coming down to make a wise and understanding people, a virtuous and puissant nation?

Digitized by Google

In every worthy Commonwealth political action is a thing of necessity. There is a school of socialists who look forward to the abolition of politics. In his dream of some golden age, William Morris believes that all State machinery will disappear, and the people will spontaneously rule and obey themselves. Contemporary socialists, like Engels and Liebknecht, expect that when the State has taken over all capital and become universal employer it will, so far from encroaching on individual rights, cease to be political at all, and 'concern itself no longer with the government of persons, but with the administration of things.' Such an idea of removing political activity from the life of society in the future only serves to show how visionary and unpractical some minds, otherwise clear and vigorous, can be when they take to world-building. It is the dream of idealogues, the fancy of cloud-dwellers who have said farewell to earth. It has been, and will be, a much-debated question as to which form of government is most conducive to a perfect State. As there must be State help, guidance, and control, it is obvious that much will depend upon the forms which the State adopts in signifying its sovereignty. When we turn to Plato's *Republic*, we find him treating, in a thorough way, the leading varieties of political organisation. What he regards as the perfect State and the perfect man is aristocracy and the aristocratical man, and what type of man and State he describes we have touched upon. It differs much from our notion of dukes and earls and the nobility in general. Plato details a scheme for eliminating his philosopher guardians, puts them through the mill of severe examinations, and brings them out sovereign men of thought and action. To place the noblest men at the summit of affairs is his ideal world, or as his modern representative, Carlyle, puts this Government of the Best: 'The Universe is a monarchy and a hierarchy, the noble in the high places, the ignoble in the low; this is in all times and in all places the Almighty Maker's law.' And our modern Plato advises to the same effect: 'Make search for the Able man. How to get him is the question of questions.' So difficult a

Digitized by Google

question, indeed, that neither Plato nor Carlyle can help mankind to solve it. Their able men, their strong men, so far as history proves, have vaulted over all the intermediate types of government, timocracy, and so forth, and ended in despotism. As we may suppose, Plato was no friend of democracy, any more than Carlyle was in his latter days. Plato believed that he was living in a degenerate age; he saw the growth of luxury, the effeminate preference of Lydian to Dorian airs in music, the decay of Spartan discipline and the growth of Corinthian licentiousness, the habit of lawlessness culminating in the excesses of democracy, when the poor win the day, expel the rich, and establish Liberty and Equality, but only as a means of greater licence to the fiery and terrible wild beasts of appetite. Carlyle uses similar words in expressing his distrust of the people: 'Democracy, take it where you will, is found a regulated method of rebellion; it abrogates the old arrangement of things, and leaves zero and vacuity. It is the consummation of no-government and *laissez faire*. . . . On this side of the Atlantic or on that, democracy is for ever impossible!'

However dangerous this political form may seem to be to men of genius, and may really be, it is the new and rising force of this age, and we are committed to it for better or for worse; democracy is the form of government for all the Anglo-Saxon race, here or across the seas. Fifty years ago, power shifted from the owners of land to the owners of capital, and now it has shifted again to the toilers. The handicraftsmen and the peasants have been admitted to electoral privileges, and what another fifty years will bring forth in their use of power it would be hard to tell. Could that widening of the franchise be based on the realisation of the interdependence of all classes in the State, there would be nothing to fear; could all classes only have a care for the common weal and less concern for self-interest, there would be everything to hope. The Constitution of which we are all so justly proud is not the work of one day or of one generation or any one set of minds. It has been built up step by step with the history of our country, and it

Digitized by Google

holds better than any other constitution the balance between authority on the one side and liberty on the other: and there inheres in it a flexibility which is the surest guarantee for its security and permanence. Every stage of political progress indicates a growing trust in the wisdom and sober judgment of the people. We have shot Niagara and nothing dangerous has happened; the current of progress flows on within well-defined, law-abiding limits. 'Rights men have none save to be governed justly,' Carlyle urged against the rising democracy, and the dictum can be accepted in a democratic sense. For, as J. S. Mill says: 'The people ought to be masters, employing servants more skilful than themselves.' The sovereign people have at length come to their inheritance, and it is of immense moment that they should use it well. It is true that the perils of sovereignty are not avoided when Demos mounts the throne. His rule may be no better than that of your Cæsar, Napoleon, or Czar, and it may be a thousand times more tyrannical. It is more than probable that the democracy, like its predecessors, will make mistakes, give way to fits of passion and spasms of greed, and when resisted by privilege will say and do savage things. All this may be taken for granted, because the people have a good deal of human nature in them. But, on the whole, they are not anarchical or revolutionary, and are least of all disposed thereto when wisely led and generously trusted. They are anxious to be and to do right, and ready to learn from any capable teacher the way in which they ought to go. It is matter for great rejoicing that they are now admitted so freely to the laden tables of the commonwealth, to a share in the treasures of education and knowledge, of art and science. All parties are eager to instal the worker in his inheritance. Science has long recognised the democratic movement and popularised its realms of discovery; Learning has issued from her classic shades, and by university extension lectures bestows her best culture throughout the towns and cities of the land; Art, surprised to find so much appreciation of beauty among the horny-handed sons of toil, throws open her galleries and

Digitized by Google

bids them walk in. Wider, and still more wide, is the sympathy which adds to this forward movement in the direction of democracy. Both parties in the State vie with each other in winning the goodwill of the people, and even the most reactionary of statesmen loudly proclaim that whatever measures make for the good of the whole community, and in response to the real demands of the people, should meet with hearty support. The newer economists are at one in the conviction that the great problem of to-morrow is to find out what are the right means of mitigating the extremes between rich and poor, what are the just laws of acquiring and distributing among the entire citizenship that wealth which modern science and civilisation have created. It is the confession of the best thinkers, and the aim of the truest reformers, that the toiling millions should have a fair share of the 'treasure and leisure and pleasure' of life; and it is only aristocrats of the exquisite, cantankerous, and empty-headed sort, who, looking on at all this, try to create a scare by raising the bogey of Socialism, or sneer at it as 'pandering to the mob.' Even the Church, though tardy enough yet in some of its sections, has begun to drop the attitude of *laissez faire*, to put off its conventional attire, and has resolved to espouse the cause of the people, and once more preach the Gospel to the poor. What are all these signs of our times but approximations to, and in some measure realisations of, the ideal State of which Plato, More, and Bacon loved to dream? We have taken the bearing-rein off the people with the most beneficial results, giving them liberty to meet (if they will) in Trafalgar Square to vent their worst grievances, and then march away without sight of a policeman's baton to provoke a riot. There are spectacles to-day among us which any continental nation might envy: 'Mr. Tom Mann giving his evidence before the Duke of Devonshire's Labour Commission; Sir John Gorst swapping nostrums with Mr. Mann; deputations clamouring for "municipal workshops" and getting sobered by the criticism even of social democrats';—here are the ideas, aspirations, and all the wild elements of the 'social revolution'

Digitized by Google

that is said to be on the way to some ideal Commonwealth, but so tamed and amenable to reason that what comes will come 'without Tom Mann having to send the Duke of Devonshire to the guillotine, or Sir John Gorst and Mr. Sydney Webb having to lead a mob of Fabians to death or glory on a barricade.' There is room for making broader yet the bounds of freedom, for the long disinherited still have but a slight percentage of the material, mental, and moral wealth produced by society; but their emancipation and regeneration is an ideal we may keep before our minds without fear, when we perceive how the democratic masses have moved on from precedent to precedent, the public safety never jeopardised, and the national greatness only growing with every expansion of freedom and every access of true opulence.

The growth of democracy is not free from dangers which master-minds like Plato and Carlyle have forecast, and some of these dangers warn us to be sober, and gird up the loins of our minds against them. Nothing is more ominously full of menace than the passion for material wealth, the lust of money, which is said to be the root of all evil. M. de Tocqueville remarks with truth that the passion for prosperity is encouraged by the growth of democracy. By ideals men live, and the ruling ideal of democratic communities is too much that of gain, comfort, and pleasure. Covetousness is the great moral peril of our time, and of the Anglo-Saxon race wherever that race has settled. It corrupts the fountains of power, it debases the organs of government, it runs the Machine to ruin. Happily among ourselves the functions of the State—legislative, executive, and judicial—are singularly free from this taint, but the same cannot be said of the league of thirty-eight commonwealths, the democracy of the United States, where a system of rings and bosses has risen up to control nearly every department of municipal and political life. In his *American Commonwealth*, Mr. Bryce informs us that 'politician' is a term of reproach, not merely among the 'superfine philosophers' of New England colleges, but among the better sort of citizens

Digitized by Google

over the whole Union. 'How did such a job come to be perpetrated?' I remember once asking a casual acquaintance who had been pointing out some scandalous waste of public money. 'Why, what can you expect from the politicians?' was the surprised answer. It is well understood that the business of politics across the Atlantic is a gainful profession. In the management of large cities, such as New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, Ring and Bossdom, with its Mammon-hunt, wields such power, through alliance with the liquor saloons, as to control the votes of electors, secure the exclusion of good men, and perpetrate untold excesses of bribery, jobbery, and robbery. The best citizens are occupied with business, often too intent on their 'pile,' and the bosses are left to peculate corporation funds and fill offices with their creatures. If such a system were the product of democracy, there can be no doubt that, as Plato states it, the democratical man would be transformed into the tyrannical, and a despotism must follow. It is not, however, of the essence of democracy, but a separable accident due in a large measure to certain conditions, such as the existence of a Spoils System, opportunities for illicit gains arising out of the possession of office, the presence of a mass of ignorant and pliable voters, and the insufficient participation in politics of the good citizens—conditions that will disappear as a civic spirit is cultivated and the people acquire the art of self-government. Although our commonwealth is exempt from such corruptions, it is marked by the same passion for wealth, and the same sordid craving for accumulation, place, and pleasure. Our chief danger at present arises from setting the highest value on riches. 'Where wealth accumulates and men decay' there cannot be national health. It must be rung into the ears of all that the true wealth of a State is men, not merchandise, that the true function of government is to foster the growth of good citizens, that material wealth is only of use when it contributes to the development of manhood, that our national prosperity is fruitful just as it distributes itself in many parts and harmonises all the elements of life. We must

Digitized by Google

recognise the reality of this great ideal, and all work to make it actual; we must learn that we have 'no rights but duties,' which can never be discharged in full. Men of property, capacity, and virtue have civic duties which it should be accounted dishonour to shirk or neglect. In all democracies the commonwealth suffers oftener from apathy and shortsightedness in the upper classes than from ignorance or recklessness in the humbler classes, who are always ready to follow when they are wisely and patriotically led. Men of worth, who know that there is a higher than selfish happiness, should strive to teach the people 'purer manners, nobler laws'; and if they refuse, as Plato and Carlyle agree, *they must be made to govern.* It is not noble for the Olive, the Vine, or the Fig in the State to hoard their own fatness and sweetness and leave King Bramble to set the whole forest on fire.

Other perils threaten the commonwealth from the existence of social and industrial warfare. We have still the spirit of Individualism causing hurt to general welfare; we have still an unrestrained and ruinous competition, which breeds discontent and anarchy. The education that brings intelligence and self-respect increases discontent with existing evils when there is a growing desire to remedy them. On the vision of the worker has dawned a higher ideal of life—that he too is a man, and that for him there ought to be a better and richer life; and with it has come a conviction that another order, industrial and social, ought to prevail. When the House of Have finds itself in sharp encounter with the House of Have Not, when the contrast stands out clear between wealth and poverty, comfort and want, brave men fear and wise men are perplexed, and all lovers of their country look around for counsel and help to heal this 'schism in the body,' which, if not healed, must end in death. Idealists solve the difficulty by constructing republics that have no private property, but that is only a counsel of perfection, and they cannot tell us how it is to be realised. There is a school of Socialism at present which thinks that a practical solution of the difficulty can be reached by extending

Digitized by Google

the sphere of the State to everything that may affect the public good. Its disciples look for the day when the State shall take over the land and means of industry, and shall undertake to grant to all persons equal rights to the stock and profits of the common fund. It may be that collective ownership of much that is at present entrusted to private enterprise will mark the industrial *régime* of the future, but State management as a remedy may be worse than the evil which it seeks to correct. It undervalues the individual, encroaches on individual rights, destroys self-reliance by making men dependent on what Government does and not on what they do themselves, and thus destroys the springs of national greatness. The plan which bestows upon society the right to exercise a despotism over the individual, to destroy individuality of character and independence of action, has not in it the ideal that will ever realise a perfect State. Men may be thus mechanically knit one to another, but this great army of dry bones will never stand upon its feet and walk, for no breath of heaven bids these dry bones live.

There is a truer Socialism, which declares man to be more than all his machines, even than the human commonwealth; which declares that every man has heritage in this world, that the good of each lies in the good of all, that possession is only stewardship, that to moral beings there are no rights but only duties, which seeks to replace a brotherhood of law by a brotherhood of love. The social and industrial changes we desire are to be reached, not by legal enactments, but through common feeling. No reform will heal social hurt while there is selfishness of heart. There will be no reign of justice till men are just, or of love till men are inspired with the charity of God. On every hand generous aspirations exist to secure among us a social order conformable to the truth of human brotherhood. When all men are brethren in deed and in truth, then will come to pass the ideal and actual Commonwealth, 'with its hierarchy of mutual service, its army of tamed passions, its invisible guard of ideal restraints, its

Digitized by Google

traditions of heroism, its hopes of greatness, its sympathy with the moral life of the world—itself the highest product of the providence of God, and the most impressive witness to the possibilities of man.'[1]

[1] *Hours of Thought*, Martineau.

Digitized by Google

XVI.

THE CITY OF GOD.

With strange persistency men have in every age dreamt of a reign of justice, of a purified society, of an actual transformation of its elements into a true and blessed order; never have they ceased to form ideals of such an order, even though history has mocked them by making the actual worse. Plato wrote his *Republic* amid the corruption and impending destruction of the Greek States; he looked for a better, and doubtless the pattern which he brought from the mount of vision helped to stay his mind in evil days, while it has hovered like a cloud of glory above mankind ever since. Dante lived in still darker days; he saw the Church asleep and the commonwealths of Italy hastening to decay, yet in the *Paradiso* we see how he comforted himself amid the confusion of the time. It is the last great vision of his book, in which he comes to Mount Zion, to the spirits of just men made perfect, and from which he could look down on a troubled world, and say—

> 'Behold how vast the circuit of our city,
> Behold our seats so filled to overflowing.'

Men must form ideals, and do this all the more because the days are evil. Some conception of the highest good of life, pure and permanent as the azure overhead, haunts our heart, and its presence in us may be taken as a prophecy of its fulfilment sometime and somewhere. After a thousand disappointments,

Digitized by Google

still it shines before men as an ideal they cannot but love and follow, a dream of perfection which all the sons of hope have striven to realise. The highest ideals are the mightiest factors of progress, and Christ stands alone as the Maker of the very highest, yet the humanest too. The ideal of Jesus is the ideal of God, and it is to be embodied in what John here calls the City of God.

It is the fault of ideal Commonwealths generally to ignore the most potent factor in the conception and realisation of a perfect society; they fail in the vision of something diviner to be desired; they do not transcend the capabilities of man's reason and will; they do not recognise an objective moral order or invoke an infinite energy as the spring of an adequate 'virtue-making power.' Is there no higher hand at work to lead on and make man what he ought to be? There can be no real emergence from the ape and tiger stage, unless we remember the saying so often proved true in the history of the world: 'The visible becomes the bestial, when it rests not on the invisible.' Religion is needed as an element in the life of the commonwealth—a strength and honour to the nation. 'Religion,' says Professor Seeley, in *The Expansion of England*, 'is the great State-building principle. The Church is the soul of the State. . . . If you find a State which is not also in some sense a Church, you find a State which is not long for this world.' Any social order must stand in some veritable connection with the higher law of heaven. If it would be true and permanent, it must recognise the presence and power of the living God. Atheism is not a system on which any real society can hold together, or a fountain out of which can flow any true zeal and spiritual tenderness for the improvement of human life. That fashion of no belief which made the eighteenth century very much, what one calls it, 'the fraudulent bankrupt century, the peculiar era of Cant,' has almost entirely disappeared, but unfortunately a paler cast of the same thought has appeared in the agnostic theory of the nineteenth century. So inveterately do these vapours of miasmal thought

Digitized by Google

cling to the intellect of our age that there exists in quarters least looked for a habit of speech that drops out the word God, and the attributes of personality, consciousness, and will, as belonging to the ultimate force of the universe. It is with a feeling of sadness one listens to the poet of 'In Memoriam,' when he sums up his religious creed in the words: 'There's a something that watches over us; and our individuality endures—that's my faith, and that's all my faith.' Truly, if that be all, it is sicklied over and over again with a pale cast of agnostic thought, until anything like robustness of faith disappears, and even as 'the irreducible minimum' of a creed there is exceedingly little to stand upon. Anything like a city built on that could not stand. Certain we are, however, that this fashion of thought will pass away like its atheistic predecessor, that the twentieth century will see *it* vanish like a ghost at cock-crow, and the being of God, as the First Cause and the Last End, laid as the granite foundation of the city, and settled foursquare on reason, conscience, faith, and hope. This foundation may be obscured, but it cannot be destroyed, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. 'Give me a standing-place,' said the old philosopher, 'and with my lever I will move the world.' That standing-place is God, and only that city will stand whose builder and maker is God.

We must clear away another error connected with the City of God—that notion which does not look for it on earth, but removes it to some transcendental and heavenly state. Dreamers of ideal societies, finding perfection nowhere on earth, have dismissed the City of God into the heavens, but the seer of Patmos takes a saner and more sensible view. When John closed the volume of Revelation with a glowing picture of the ideal City, he did not refer as many strangely refer it to heaven, but to earth. He placed the scene of it in this present world: 'And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God, out of heaven.' What heaven itself may be we cannot say, but at anyrate the city described in the Book of God is not set up in heaven, but on earth; and Scripture, we may

Digitized by Google

venture to say, does not employ anywhere the figure of a city to describe the glory of the celestial state. The plan of the ideal City originates in heaven—that is, in the mind of God; the whole completed city is represented by John as coming down all at once to this earth, as if no long preparations or slow processes of evolution had to do with its descent. Because godly men have reversed John's statement, and transferred the City of God to a supramundane region, they have learned to picture life as a pilgrimage through a wilderness to a celestial city, and left this world to the devil and his servants. At an early period came the idea into the Church that religion meant saving the soul as some mysterious entity that had nothing to do with the body and this world, but to get out of both as soon as possible, and the last three centuries of Protestant teaching have strongly emphasised that view of religion. Bunyan's immortal allegory of the *Pilgrim's Progress* presents this kind of Christianity in its most fascinating form, but hardly anything could be more unlike the Christianity of Christ. For instead of bidding a man flee from the City of Destruction to save his soul, Christ would rather have him to remain in the city and help others to escape not to heaven, but to a better life here; Christ would rather bid him grapple with the destructions of the city, free it of its unrighteous laws, clear its streets of all corruptions, and change it into the 'holy city, New Jerusalem.'

The Family of God, the City of God, the Kingdom of God,—such are the three categories under which the Book of God sets forth its moral and social ideal of a perfectly organised state of being, of a regenerate and purified society on this earth. It is through these three forms of organic life that God's ideal of man is to be realised, made manifest, and brought to perfection. In the Family of God we are to seek the first image of the highest good, to find the first sign of heaven on earth. In the Kingdom of God the widest field for the embodiment of the supreme good is suggested. But in the City of God the realisation of His ideal will be that of man reaching the perfect form of his free, ordered, and richly beautiful life.

Digitized by Google

What man is here for, we are told, is to make cities; and since Cain built the first one, which must have been small, the passion of city-building has been one of the ambitions of the human race. Among the oldest, mightiest, and most audacious builders were the men who gathered on the plain of Shinar to erect the tower of Babel. 'And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name.' Thus early in the history of the world do we learn that the ambition to make cities, being often for wicked purposes, embodies a spirit of evil, pride, tyranny, godlessness, which is apt to pass beyond control, and lead to untold possibilities of sin and suffering. The associative instinct is one of man's strongest characteristics, the noblest dynamical force of his nature, in connection with which the grandest tokens of his genius and energy have been displayed; but the earliest model of this principle on the plain of Shinar also exhibits another feature in man, even the ambition to make a name for himself *with God left out*; and in looking down the stream of his history we find him to be the same self-seeking, self-exalting, God-excluding creature, throughout. Take the great historic cities of the world—Nineveh and Babylon, Tyre and Sidon, Athens and Rome, Paris and London—and you find in them the most perfect monumental records of commerce, art, and civilisation, all that illustrates the genius and glory of man, but not one of them could be designated in fairness the City of God. It is the city of man we see in all these centres of the thought, the achievement, the culture, and the life of nations. In the Apocalypse, John gives us in vivid contrast the fabric and scenery of two cities—the City of Man and the City of God; the City of Man as it has been and the City of God as it will be; the one in its fulness of wealth and pride of power going to destruction, and the other in its holiness and splendour, 'having the glory of God' to enlighten it and 'the Lamb to be the light thereof.' The City of Man is represented by 'Babylon the Great,' the Babel of old developed to the utmost capacity of material greatness and glory. It is 'that great city, which

Digitized by Google

reigneth over the kings of the earth.' Her magnificence is dilated upon, just as historians have dilated upon the forty miles of wall that enclosed, and the hanging gardens that adorned, the ancient city of Babylon. Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, but the inspired seer uses a symbolism which expands the city of human might till it is made to include the merchandise of Tyre, the art of Greece, the might of Rome, and all the proud resources of other historic capitals. Craftsmen, of whatsoever craft, are found in her; her merchants are the great men of the earth, bringing to her 'the merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men.' This city is the place of all delights. 'The voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters is heard in her.' 'The merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.' Men chant their pæans over this queen of cities. Every shipmaster, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, cried . . . saying, 'What city is like unto this great city?' The old seer of Patmos sings no cantata to the might of this City of Man, but he can duly appreciate and magnify its resources. And the description which he gives of city life in his day, whether it be Rome or Corinth, or old Jerusalem itself, would be applied by him with equal fitness in our days to city life—to the stir of life on the banks of the Thames no less truly than on the banks of the Tiber.

Notwithstanding these acquisitions of the city, they are counterbalanced by evils manifold and unhealthy, and fatal to life and happiness. Contemplate a city with a million, or, like London, with four million people crowded into it; survey its outward, physical conditions. Miles of country are covered with flimsy, often squalid houses; thousands of factory chim-

Digitized by Google

neys vomit out smoke and soot, poisoning the air and withering every green thing for miles around; the silver stream is choked up with refuse or turned into a big sewer; hundreds of thousands of over-worked, under-fed men and women are packed into a labyrinth of dull, unwholesome streets, that breed contagious diseases, and take the sunshine out of men's lives. In spite of railways and telegraphs, electric lamps and infinite machinery to multiply the resources of the rich and add to the poverty of the poor, giving to him that hath and taking from him who hath not that which he has, these great material appliances tend to lower civilisation among the vast masses of city life, and sink it into chaos, neglect, and misery. Our present type of society—of boundless luxury and self-indulgence at one end of the scale, and at the other disease and poverty—has always marked the city of man's building. To an extent vastly aggravated it prevailed in Babylon and Rome.

And when we seek under the surface, we come upon the causes that lead inevitably to the overthrow of cities. If we find out why the first Babylon fell, and why the last, we shall likewise know why all between have gone the same road. It was Babylon's wealth and luxury, or, going deeper still, it was her selfishness and pride and atheism that sapped her foundations and hurled her to ruin. The same forces of corruption are still at work in the heart of great cities. In old Babylon, as in every later Babylon, a man was accounted less precious than the golden wedge of Ophir; the *person* was sacrificed to the *thing*, and godless tyrannies oppressed the poor, laying on them heavy burdens, and compelling them to do the work of beasts. Wherever this Babylonian principle is acted upon, it overturns all the deeper and truer principles upon which human society can be solidly founded. 'The most splendid city that was ever raised in the earth will fall down, and all its palaces perish, if it is merely formed of bricks and slime, which men have substituted for the living stones which God has hewn out and fitted together.'[1]

[1] Maurice's *Kings and Prophets of the Old Testament.*

Digitized by Google

We are often told that cities make men, but hitherto it has been the other way, for cities have rather marred than made them, from their merchant princes down to their meanest toilers. The commercial spirit, with its selfishness and avarice; the ambitious spirit, with its self-glorification and disregard of right and wrong in dealing with others; the competitive spirit, with its ruthless purpose to get the biggest share of the spoil; the sensual spirit, with its love of luxury and desire for gratification;—all these find a hotbed in the city, and have made its honourable men and the multitude alike incapable of recognising a moral order of truth and righteousness, and turned them into arrogant and sordid monopolists, or brutish and slavish creatures, ready for destruction.

In affirming such things of the City of Man—of a pagan, godless civilisation, there may be much, let us acknowledge, of this civilisation which is good, and not to be despised. Commerce in itself cannot with any reason be denounced. A venal spirit may too easily creep into it; too often has it turned the city into a warehouse or exchange, and required the whip of cords to be effectively laid on its back; but as a means of increasing the conveniences of human life, it deserves to be pursued. The arts and wealth of the world it is a species of folly to despise. When they minister to higher ends, they rank among things good and beautiful. The gold and silver, the wood and stone, are not merely dead things, but capable of being shaped into form, quickened with thought, spiritualised in expression, and made conformable to a sense of order and the Common Good, which is in the heart of man. There is no reason why the earthly and magnificent should not belong to the city—there is every reason for its presence, but if it is not to be of the earth earthy, then what is divine and spiritual must be in all, and over all; it must be a continual revelation of that which passeth show.

In saying this, we come face to face with a distinctive feature of the City of God—the *Holy* City—holy, because all the true

Digitized by Google

tendencies of man have full play in it, all earthly treasures are gathered into it, and the earthly magnificence is but a manifestation of inward and spiritual dominion. The City of God flames with all precious and glorious things. Gold is there in abundance; its streets are paved with 'pure gold, as it were transparent glass.' What lords it so often over man, now and here, is yet to be put under his feet; the *thing* will be less precious than the *person*; all that is mercenary and profane—the oppressive materialism of Babylon—will disappear in the supreme spiritual beauty and goodness of the New Jerusalem. Whatever of fulness, ripeness, and completeness it is possible for human society to attain, the rapt seer in his apocalyptic vision represents to us. He believes in a perfect humanity, such as the city is meant to develop, but hitherto has failed to construct; he looks for a fair organised life that shall secure the highest good of the individual in the unity of a common life. 'The Holy City!'—there is the most perfect realisation of the true life of man. 'New Jerusalem!' there is the great fulfilment of ancient hopes and of the long travail of our race.

The City of God has been building through many ages; it has been in the Architect's plan from the beginning, before His works of old. Space does not allow us to show that it is a completing of the self-provisions of Nature, and that something like an anticipation of it may be read in the operations of biological law and the perfecting of the bodily organism. Nor do we stop to weigh the important observation that 'God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth,' but taking these as well-grounded data for the hope of a perfect society, we turn to the Bible as an imperishable record of the long preparation and partial realisation and ultimate completion of the City of God. 'In the beginning God'—are the words with which it opens the marvellous account; and with an immanent God it keeps the hope of man, like an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, to a prospect of which history has a thousand times made him despair. It places before us the individual life, in one brief but bright moment, only to proceed

Digitized by Google

at once with what is necessary even to the perfection of individual life—to present the social life in which divine preparations are to be completed and human capacities are to be fulfilled. It records the creation, not only of the man of God, but of the City of God. The outstanding points of this history are all we can notice.

Out from the plain of Shinar, in the grey dawn of time, where and when the builders of Nineveh and Babylon were busy at work, we see the first distinct personality in history going forth at the call of God, 'not knowing whither he went.' It is Abraham, the first Pilgrim Father of the race, deliberately turning his back on the godless, idolatrous cities of his birthplace, and becoming a sojourner—a dweller without citizenship—in the land of Canaan. What drew him to a tent-life there? The tent had no foundations—it could be struck in half-an-hour and gone. What did he expect? A vision, not of God only, but of the City of God, burnt in his soul, and kindled him into hope. 'Abraham dwelt in tents, *because* he looked for the City which hath the foundations, of which the Architect and the Artificer is God.' It was no city above the clouds he dreamt of, but a City of God on earth, the City of a truer and purer faith than the Babylon he had left behind. And so he became the first citizen of that invisible, spiritual City yet to be, embodying its ideal in some fair measure, and observing its well-ordered and obedient life. The City of God came down into, and took form in, his tent, although necessarily limited and imperfect there. Abraham's tent represented it so far as holding the first true unit of any social ideal—as enclosing the first *family of God*. There, under the first earthly conditions, existed a reflection of the Divine nature and rule, and there the law of *living for others* as the effect of *living by others* found some worthy exercise. How complete the rule of God was in Abraham's household is witnessed to by the offering of Isaac. Whatever God willed, he would obey with entire, unquestioning, and absolute self-sacrifice; and so he took that long, silent, heart-breaking journey to Mount Moriah, and he bound Isaac,

Digitized by Google

laid him on the wood, stretched out his hand to slay till the offering in spirit was made perfect. Then did he see the day of Christ afar off, and was glad; he obtained a vision of some of the 'glorious things' spoken of the City of God—a vision, it may be in part, of an elect nation, of Salem's shrines, of a Diviner Sacrifice, and of wide Commonwealths of his Seed, 'in which all families of the earth would be blessed.'

Let us advance another stage. At the foot of Sinai a horde of slaves stands a free people, the seed of Abraham whom Moses, the great moral hero of antiquity, brought out of Egypt, that he might organise them into a nation and make them the people of God—a veritable theocracy. To him Israel, and the world, owe the Ten Words, the conception of a spiritual God, who loves righteousness and mercy, and the ethical environment of a moral life. 'I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage'; and this preface to the Decalogue stamps Israel with the features of an elect people and a separate individuality, while the Decalogue itself joins religion and morality into indissoluble union, and sets forth Jehovah as before all gods, not as a physical deity but a moral Being, not as a tribal god but God over all. This revelation of God at Sinai in a universal code of morals is of sovereign importance in the work of building the City of God, because it proclaimed the things by which nations live, and by neglect of which they perish. Israel had, on this account, an end beyond itself, acting as the vehicle of the true religion and the bearer of its benefits to all mankind. That glorious and supreme idea, of a Divine moral order—of an authoritative law of duty which binds men to God and one another—it was the mission of Moses to teach and to realise among the people of the Exodus.

Ages roll on, and the nation of Israel found a centre of religious and moral and social life. A city is set up, the first city on earth worthy to be called the City of God—Jerusalem, with its temple-crowned height. 'Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion, on the sides of the

Digitized by Google

north, the City of the great King.' It is the City of the living God, because He abides in it, and flames from it in the greatness and glory of His manifestations. Only in partial form does it answer to the name, yet not in any heathenish or material localising of Deity is it His abode. For the ark in the temple, which made Jerusalem the 'Holy City,' is the 'ark of the covenant of the God of the whole earth.' It is there an abiding witness of His invisible presence, an assurance to the city and to the land of Israel, and to the whole world, that in God is the secret of strength, the ground of fellowship, the pledge of permanence for any nation's prosperity and greatness. Old Jerusalem is a great onward step in the purpose of the ages, as being, not only a real though partial embodiment of God's presence, but likewise a prophecy of the perfect City, 'having the glory of God.'

The prophetic era, from the eighth century B.C. downwards, is a period rich in discovery of the laws and principles necessary to building the City of God. It is alive throughout with the idea of the self-realisation of God in humanity, making the ethical and spiritual supreme alike in what is revealed of man's nature as well as of God's. The prophets answer to the guardians whom Plato requires in his ideal Republic, but they have a finer education and diviner insight and grander passion for righteousness than it entered Plato's mind to conceive; they were not philosophers in some transcendental sphere, where nothing could be known or verified, nor yet were they popular demagogues echoing opinions and passions of the hour. On the contrary, they were teachers of deep wisdom, statesmen of far-reaching purpose, and reformers of unselfish zeal, all intent on rearing a Holy City among men. Look at Isaiah, Jeremiah, or Amos, and what clothes them with a special halo? It is not possession of some magic art of prediction—of reading inverted history; it is a gift of insight, rather than of foresight, by which, under the Spirit of God, they are able to penetrate to the moral and spiritual core of the world, to recognise the laws of a Divine Presence and Government, the inherent might of right,

Digitized by Google

the tendency of selfishness to sap the vitality of nations, and the ultimate victory of good over evil. From their local centre in old Jerusalem—from Zion's towers, they watch the drama of history, and bear witness to elect citizens and surrounding nations, of One who is Lord of the whole earth, and of the triumphs which unseen Righteousness would achieve over all evil powers. And that gave large foresight, filling them with the hope of a Golden Age, and focussing their aspirations into forecasts of an ideal King and an ideal Kingdom. 'These three things,' it has been well said, 'the highest boons of God to men—a moral Hero, a Kingdom of the good, and the moral Hero making Himself the King of that Kingdom, by spiritual insight and self-sacrifice, as the suffering Servant of God, are the chief fruitage of that remarkable group of prophecies usually called Messianic, which embody the optimistic ideals of Hebrew seers.'[1]

A survey of the Old Testament shows it to be a revelation of God and man, which, purifying, enlightening, reconciling, leads up to a divinely human life as a perfect and permanent expression of both. Its earliest and latest records are pregnant with auguries of a noble future, inspired by the consciousness of an ideal which at first is seen dimly in outline, but grows more defined and certain—an ideal which, so far from proving an illusion or airy vision, culminates in the perfect revelation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. When we turn to the Gospels for a knowledge of the Jesus of history, we are not met with claims that declare Him to be the ideal King or incarnate Redeemer of men, but find Him to be one of the humblest and humanest of beings—meek and lowly in heart, the Son of Man among sons of men, loving them, talking with them, and eating with them; but as we get beside Him on the hills and by the shores of Galilee, and listen to His words, they seem to be the sweetest and wisest ever spoken to men. Although they do not fill the space of half-a-dozen sermons, they surpass in value the writings of all the world's sages; although His ministry is the

[1] A. B. Bruce, D.D., *Apologetics.*

Digitized by Google

briefest on record, it has become the mightiest and most imperishable in its results, and proves Him to be the supreme Master-builder in connection with the City of God.

What is the subject of His teaching? What is the moral ideal which He brings forth to men? The central idea of His teaching—the commonest phrase on His lips—was 'the Kingdom of God.' Wherever He went He preached 'the Kingdom of God'; He prefaced His parables with the words: 'The Kingdom of Heaven is like—'; He sent forth Apostles 'to preach the Kingdom of God.' Under this category He sets forth the moral ideal for man, His conception of the highest good; it is essentially and chiefly a social and not an individual ideal. Ritschl observes that the teaching of Jesus is not a circle with one centre, but an ellipse with two foci—the doctrine of the Kingdom of God and the doctrine of personal salvation; but the later doctrine can quite fairly be classed under the general category of the 'Kingdom of God,' and viewed among its positive benefits. Jesus did not invent the phrase when He announced the coming of the Kingdom of God; it was familiar to every Jew in His time; He derived it from the prophets, who expressed by it their ideal of the good time coming. But if He did not make the phrase, He made the thing. For what He meant by it entirely contradicted the notions common in His day. The Jews were full of misconceptions as to the true character of the Kingdom; they thought it was confined to Israel, and consisted of outward earthly prosperity and splendour, and would be visibly manifested in glory through a sudden miraculous interposition of God. Over against these external, national, and temporal expectations Christ placed His ethical, spiritual, and universal idea of the Kingdom. Nor did He set forth this as its true nature only, but He announced it as having already come—as being there and then on this earth. The new ideal and order should not be viewed as a future heavenly state of perfection, but as an immediate reality and actual reign of God in truth and righteousness and love. 'Jesus possessed,' to quote Wendt's words, 'from the first too

Digitized by Google

keen a consciousness of an already existing state of gracious fellowship with His Father in heaven, too rich an experience of the possession of Divine power and of guidance by the Fatherly love of God, and too firm confidence in the accessibility of this blessed state to all other men, to lead Him to believe or to proclaim the Kingdom of God to be a merely future and heavenly one, and not rather as being in essence already in course of realisation here upon earth.' Surely we may say that the hour which ushered in and began to realise this glorious ideal of the Kingdom of God was the supreme hour in the history of man, and yet there were moments in it of still mightier significance before the reality of citizenship could be made possible in the City of the great King. For the Messianic King, to be a Messianic Redeemer, must likewise be a Messianic Sufferer. God's self-disclosure came to completeness in His Person and Work. Here is the wondrous romance of the love-tale of eternity—that within the perfect Man, and, looking through, we find the perfect God, and that the chief part of His work is to atone for the sins of the world by His death on the Cross, and crown the whole by rising to the throne of Heaven. In the 'Holy City, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven,' we are told that 'the Lamb is the light thereof.' He is the King of Glory, because He is 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.' 'He loved me, and gave Himself for me; and I am His'—such is the glad testimony of every citizen. He is the supreme Person, because He is the supreme Good for all. In Him we have the all-commanding Motive, the all-sufficient Standard, the absolute Pattern of human life. Every generation finds in Him the type which fulfils its highest aspirations, inspires its deepest devotion, satisfies its innermost needs. Of His fulness have eighteen ~~hundred~~ centuries received, and He is still the source of all that is purest and best in modern civilisation.

The Church is the creation of our risen Lord. By the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost He called the Church into being; He formed a body of believers in union

Digitized by Google

with Himself to act as the organ of the City and Kingdom of God, to announce its advent, issue its laws, incarnate its spirit, and make universal its righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost. In those early days of the Church's birth appeared a fair, bright token of the actual Divine Commonwealth—of the Christian ideal touching the very summit of realisation, when thousands of hearts, all aglow with an intense corporate life, met together in a gracious fellowship and 'had all things common.'

In the Epistles, and specially those of Paul, the idea of the Kingdom of God falls into the background, does not hold the same prominence given to it in the teaching of Jesus, and Paul's sway becomes greater than that of his Master, though we must add that Paul's doctrines of forgiveness and justification are likewise genuine elements in the Gospel of Christ. In the Apocalypse, however, John closes with the vision of a 'New Jerusalem' that affords us the assurance of an indestructible spiritual order and the hope of a reconstructed and perfect society on earth.

For a time the presence of persecutions, the strife of parties, and the exigencies of individual churches, kept the new Social Order out of sight; but when Rome was dying of her pagan corruptions, herself become a city of confusion, and her world-wide dominion returning to chaos, Augustine stood forward, and in his *Civitas Dei* held over the dissolute city a fair vision and actual realisation of the City of God. When barbarian hordes poured into the metropolis of the world, who awed them and stayed the ruin? Not the rich and selfish citizens, who fled, but the Christians, who remained to defend weak women and shelter the poor in their churches. This city of earth had for fourteen generations sent out its legions and built up such greatness that its later poets and orators ceased not to descant on its world-wide empire, and call it eternal, imperial, and divine; but now it is rotting to pieces through the vice and luxury of its citizens. Augustine is moved to set before proud Romans another city much more glorious in ideal and achievement,

Digitized by Google

built by a stronger hand, and destined to be more enduring, the virtues of whose citizens are the only forces that save Rome from utter destruction.

The old Roman Empire disappears, and on its ruins a new order begins to shape itself; and under the common bond of the Church, with her unity of faith and discipline, the foundations were laid 'of a new power over men's souls more durable than that which Rome had lost over their bodies.'[1] The choice of Rome for its centre made it successor and representative alike of the memories and hopes of the vanished empire; and if this power had been inward and purely spiritual, uncontaminated with wealth, ambition, and intrigue, unburdened with corrupting details of government, and undesirous of temporal sovereignty; if it had known no other mission than that of being a divinely-ordained adviser to awaken, moderate, and harmonise the conflicting forces of society—there would have been no Dark Ages, and the City of God would have risen into supernal greatness and glory. The vision of that City shone before such master-builders as Leo I., Gregory the Great, and Hildebrand; they gazed on it as into some meridian splendour, and then strove to make the Divine righteousness, as they understood it, the universal law not only of the Church but of all those peoples whom the Church might instruct. It was the ambition of their lives to Christianise the nations, and they did not hesitate to grasp at temporal power in order to secure this end. Through the Middle Ages a universal religious State preserved something like a brotherhood of mankind, a Commonwealth of the whole world; and had the unity been inward and spiritual, as it was outward and formal, the Christian idea of the Kingdom of God must have neared perfection. But in course of time it became an ecclesiastical despotism, well-nigh fatal to the interests of secular advance and social order.

At the Reformation the Papacy succumbed beneath the weight of its venalities and superstitions, and this spiritual tyranny came to an end. As a religious movement, the Re-

[1] Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*.

Digitized by Google

formation went back on Paul's Gospel, asserting once more the inward and spiritual, the supreme worth of the individual soul, and its right to draw near to God without a human priest, and obtain the Divine blessing for itself. But while it reaffirmed the law of individuality, it broke up the unity of Christendom, led to wars of religion for more than a century, created a series of National Churches in the several Protestant countries of Europe armed with the same coercive powers as the Church of the Middle Ages, and thus tended to further disruptions, in the midst of which the only radiant hope still comes from the mount of vision, 'that great City, holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven, and having the glory of God.'

From this survey it will appear that the City of God is a historical fact on the earth, and the grandest of all facts, with its foundations laid, its laws revealed, its relationships formed, its virtues resplendent, and its energies at work. It is Christianity as the highest good; that Kingdom of God, or rule of righteousness and love, Christ came preaching at the beginning of His ministry; that great ideal for human society which shines like a heaven of light in the New Testament, like a burst of sunset glory on its last pages, to which all things are working together, to which all ages and movements among men are tending, and which is, generation after generation, passing into reality.

The *foundations* of the City are God Himself, in the unity of His being, and in the variety of His manifestations as the merciful Father, the redeeming Son, and the renewing Spirit. Herein lies the source of its unity and coherence, of its riches, grandeur, and adaptability to human necessities. The City is of God, and in God, and for God. Society has but one centre, holding its million units together, and binding them into a true fellowship. It is not meant to be a mere collection of individuals, living, one by one, apart from each other, though related to God, but a vital organism into which the heavenly spirit, all around and near, loves to pour the Godhead's fulness of blessing. Having these foundations solid as the granite hills, the

Digitized by Google

City of God never will, and never can, be a creed, hard and fixed, but must be a spirit, an ideal, an aspiration renewing itself day by day, fresh and young, from its fountain of life.

The *privileges* of the City are as many and untold as the Fatherly goodness of God and the unsearchable riches of Christ can supply — blessings of forgiveness, adoption into God's family, holiness, and happiness; benefits of love, brotherhood, mutual helpfulness, and all that can enrich, beautify, and ennoble the City; gifts of eternal life. When these things are sought as the first good of life, earthly blessings in their due measure will be received. For while Christ, the Master-builder of the City, esteemed earthly good things of no absolute worth in securing man's true life and welfare, and strove to exclude the notion of material benefits from the Old Testament and Jewish ideal of the Divine Kingdom, He was yet far from depreciating or rejecting such benefits, and regarded them, if not as an end, undoubtedly as a means, in relation to the higher life.

The *relations* of the City are determined by the fundamental revelation of Fatherhood in God. Out of that Divine Fatherhood comes the brotherhood of men, as they are the sons of God; and in the spirit of brotherhood, the ideally perfect life, while entirely real, is to be pursued. 'One is your Father, and ye are brethren'—that is the Gospel on which the re-organisation of earthly ties is to proceed, and a Divine order of humanity must be achieved. The citizens, as sons of God, possess equal rights and privileges, but by love serve one another; every member contributing to the good of the whole, and the good of the whole becoming the possession of each.

The *laws* of the City are few and simple, yet thorough and complete; not codified and arranged, yet harmonious and symmetrical. In point of form, they are *inward* and *spiritual*. 'The Kingdom of God is within you'—in the very hearts of men, ruling them from within, and passing outward over all. The spiritual is the ultimate root of all life, and in the spirit of

Digitized by Google

man the laws of the City find reverence and obedience. Character is what they primarily work in, create, and establish; their action on the soul is the first condition of social order and progress.

> 'Your Fouriers failed,
> Because not poets enough to understand
> That life develops from within.'

They are *individual and collective.* The moral ideal begins with each man, calling forth individuals, and accentuating the sovereignty of the private conscience. It respects and honours, develops and uses, the individuality of every man. The solitary relation between the soul and its God may not be violated; the fullest measure of personal well-being is to be sought. But that aim must contemplate social welfare, and contribute to it. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Only through society does the individual come to any perfectness of good, and therefore he must pay his share to the common stock, or disgrace his citizenship. 'Each man for himself, each for his private good'—is not a principle that can bind or regenerate society; it is centrifugal, competitive, and ruinous. But the good of the individual as a means of good to society is an architectural and constructive principle, fully at work in building the City of God. The balance needed between the personal and social we find in the golden rule: 'Therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' It is a law of righteousness, inward and personal, civic and social, between man and man, between man, woman, and child. It is a law of fellowship and co-operation, in which there are no rights but only duties, in which the total functions and activities of manhood are laid out for the common weal, in which the laws of love, sacrifice, and service are productive of ever-increasing good. Such are the formative ideals that contribute, as they are more and more widely realised, to the building of the City of God.

In this way the City of God grows into the City of Man. For its aim is to realise upon earth Christ's grand ideal of brother-

Digitized by Google

hood. The Babylon John speaks of is the City of the Man-God, the society of man who would, in his pride, ascend up to heaven and exalt his throne above the stars of God. He wants to be above all law, to assert his own will, and trample upon his fellows as if they were mere things created for his use; he seeks to be a God by rising above men and degrading them. But New Jerusalem, that is to be the mother of us all, is the City of the God-Man, that perfect reconciliation of divinity and humanity seen in its ideal citizen—the Son of God, who humbled Himself and took upon Him the form of a servant. It is the City of God, because God is immanent in it with a fulness of life and service which seeks to be man-wide and universal. Divine infinitude, holding free relation to the finite, and recognising man as the organ of the Divine, and capable of union with God, longs to reveal and realise itself in the life and love of spirits made in its own image, capable of reflecting that image to an unparalleled extent and of sharing in an infinite and eternal life. Herein works the law of the incarnation, and herein comes forth the effect of the atonement of Christ, and herein have we the ground and realisation of the song sung by the prophet in the land of Judah: 'We have a strong city. Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in.'

Such an idea does not involve the suppression of man's individuality. On the contrary, Christ discovered the individual, and asserted the rights of every soul of man; while it is shown in the City of God how the individual man, unmade by sin, is to be remade after the image and ideal of God. As long as he remains in his separateness, much of what is in him lies dormant, but when he becomes part of a great whole, and does his part therein, dormant capacities are elicited, and endless possibilities of service lie before him. Therefore God's Gospel for him is a 'City,' a Divine Commonwealth, of which he is made a citizen, and in which he finds perfection through the perfection of the whole.

Digitized by Google

Here is the Gospel of Humanitarianism in its true and abiding power, not that present-day form of it which is still the worship of the Man-God, whose formula is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. We can only elevate society by elevating men; 'the citizens make the city,' and good citizens are its real wealth. The only way we can elevate men is by elevating man, and more of the true manhood can only be got as it is filled with all the fulness of God. Humanity, enveloped at present in eternal love, developed at length by a consciousness of that love within as well as without, till in it the life of the Eternal be realised, and its own possibilities are complete,—that is the vision which John by the Spirit conceived amid the confusions of his time, and which we, dipping into the future, far as we can see, are to hold up before our eyes: 'Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people.'

It is to be desired that this City of God and man, yet to be on the earth, drew to it the fervour of saintly aspiration and hope which, generation after generation, has been transferred to that vision of it which has fled into the heavens. Inspired truth assures us that the City of God is descending ever more out of heaven, but nowhere gives us like assurance that heaven itself is to be conceived of under the same figure. Whatever may be the variety and fulness of joy in that unfallen and sinless world, Scripture bids us concentrate the glow of prophetic and anticipative ecstasy not on that, but on a regenerate and glorious society here. Not for heaven, but for earth; not for any untold City there, but for the sure City yet to be here, should we learn to sing—

'Jerusalem the golden,
With milk and honey blest,
Beneath thy contemplation
Sink heart and voice opprest.
I know not, O, I know not,
What social joys are there;
What radiancy of glory,
What light beyond compare!'

Digitized by Google

As there can be no true city on earth which is not also a city of man, it is time to inquire how it can be built, and what are the building forces at work. Some have thought that such a new order of society will be a sudden and immediate transformation wrought at any moment by the hand of God, or that the City of God will yet come down out of heaven in the twinkling of an eye; but such is not the Divine method, so far as we know it, in any of the higher forms of life, and least of all as Scripture teaches with regard to the moral and organic progress of mankind. Scripture is an age-long record of the evolution of man and society. Through the cycles of the past one increasing purpose runs, and the far-off Divine event to which it tends is the City of God. And the building force, since Christ's advent, is the Church, which is His special creation, and which He created for that very purpose. The Church is the body of Christ, the redeemed body of humanity, of which Christ is the Head, baptized with His Spirit, inspired with His truth, built into a holy communion, and ruled over by His living and royal presence. It is not the City of God, but the organ of the City—the instrument with which Christ, the Architect, advances the building of the City. Its prerogative functions are socially redemptive and renewing, through which it embodies Christ's grand ideal of a human brotherhood, based on the Divine Fatherhood, into which all that is pure, gracious, noble, and immortal comes down from God out of heaven, that it may permeate the members and flow forth among men. In partial and limited measure have such functions at any time been performed; but, in the final and perfect form of society John represents here, the Church discharges those functions with complete success. The redeemed 'serve God, and see His face, and His name shall be on their foreheads.' It is the Church's office to promote those ends, doing so imperfectly now, but then perfectly. 'The City without a Church' is a modern way of translating John's ideal City; it would be quite as true to say, 'the Church without a City.' It is misleading to say that old Jerusalem was all temple, and the ideal of the New

Digitized by Google

was no temple; it would be nearer the truth to say that New Jerusalem was all temple, while the old had only one local, visible, conspicuous sanctuary. When John says that he 'saw no temple therein,' he only contrasts universal with local worship, and expresses in vivid metaphor the Master's saying that 'the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.' A God-inhabited society like what John describes is surely all temple, and that is John's view of it, for he goes on to say, 'The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.'

Let us understand more and more clearly that the Church is the social organ of the will of Christ, alike in its worship, testimony, and effort, to represent and realise human society in the highest. 'The expectation of the Church—the ideal ever shining before it—is the vision of the City of God. This vision of a perfected Christian society has risen before the builders and founders of churches; it has led on the greatest movements of missionary power; it has produced reformations within the Church; it redeems and ennobles pages in Church history which otherwise might seem dark, narrow, and intolerant.'[1]

The City of God is a Divine and Christian ideal of the highest good realised in all human relations, affording them normal development, and enabling them to reach a final and perfect harmony. It is an ideal that has been actualised in Christ, and finds its central fulfilment in the imitation of Christ. It is the good Christian, therefore, who is to be the loyal citizen wherever he may live, who is to translate the elements of ideal citizenship into character and life, and exhibit in all relations 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, and whatsoever things are of good report.' The working out of this noble ideal of society

[1] *Christian Ethics*, Newman Smyth, D.D.

Digitized by Google

is what we call applied Christianity. Now, many Christian people make it almost a boast that they have no regard for citizen duties and no interest in public affairs. They think that religion needs to be kept undefiled by contact with secular and civic affairs, and, no doubt, that is true. They quote Christ's saying, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' and misquote it, because they imply that His Kingdom was not designed to rule over this world, when all He meant was that He did not derive His authority from this world. Not so have Christian heroes and reformers acted in critical periods of the Church's or nation's history. It was not so in Reformation days when Luther and Knox were intent upon a noble and Christian State. It was not so in the days of the Commonwealth when Christ's men were State's men, who regarded the interests of society as sacred, contended for public justice, peace, and order, and felt the legislator's work a heaven-descended trust. It was not so with their descendants across the Atlantic, who sought to build up a Christian republic, who took the most active part in all duties attending the right of suffrage, and through all civic functions strove to keep high the tone of moral life. God is the God, Christ is the King, of our whole life. The problem of Church and State is one that every individual as well as every community must work out, not into an unrelated separateness or sham alliance, but into an actual and complete harmony. The best citizenship is the best Christianship, and *vice versâ*. Happily, the application of Christianity to the public life of our time is one of its best omens; the ideals of to-day are mainly dominated by the moral sentiment and the aspiration for a better social order. It is the proof of a City descending out of heaven from God in our day. Any Christian, who can read this sign, stands before an Apocalypse, and may salute it in John's words: 'I saw the holy city, new London, new Edinburgh, new Dumbarton.' He may see approaching that ideal which is to set the style for the building of all cities and states till they are erected into the Commonwealth of God. The times are ripe, the fulness is

Digitized by Google

near, and the City of God is ready for a more glorious descent. Christ has come to claim the whole great circle of human life, to utilise all the organs and institutions of society for the promotion of the highest good, and to open the truest sources of inspiration whereby the City of God may be translated into every town and village and hamlet throughout the world. We cannot speak in detail of this realisation in every human sphere, but may refer to three of these.

The Church of Christ exists to spiritualise and purify the domain of Politics.

It is true that Jesus did not interfere with politics, because politics in our sense did not then exist, and could not exist under a world-wide despotism, frowning over a rotten civilisation based on slavery; there was no voice of the people constitutionally uttering itself under the Roman Empire, and therefore Christ came to discover the individual, assert his supreme value, and make him fit for civic rights and duties. At the same time He taught His doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and said, 'The Kingdom of God is like unto leaven'—something that does the work of leaven, that mixes with and raises that which is unleavened; and how quickly it wrought a revolution we know when men began to think that it endangered the civil and military laws of the empire, and cried, 'Behold these men that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.' In less than three centuries the Prince of this world, *Divus Augustus Dominus Orbis Terrarum*, had inscribed the Cross on his standards, and ever since the Christian society has wrought at the task of transforming political institutions. It awed the hordes of powerful barbarians that menaced the Roman Empire, and softened their manners, and gave them tribunals and laws. It has emancipated woman and the slave from a condition still to be seen in Oriental countries. To it the past owes nearly every vivifying principle which has

Digitized by Google

preserved society, advanced civilisation, and elevated the dignity of man. Nor is the whole lump leavened, or the realisation of the Christian ideal complete, in the political sphere. New bulwarks of the City of God on earth have yet to be upreared. Jesus Christ is the Author of Democracy; He enfranchised the people, and thus created politics in the fullest sense, and broadened the border of public life. The once dim and shadowy people now stand erect, with power to shape and determine the affairs of a world-wide dominion. What will be their temper and aims? The effect has been to enlarge the life and service of our best men and institutions, and if we can but hold a sight of the City of God before their eyes we need not fear whatever new and strange developments may be at hand. Since the people have the vote, they need to be educated in the habits and responsibilities of free citizens, and the power to educate must still be found in the Christianity of Christ, that is as much a religion for the polling-booth and the House of Commons as for the House of God and the prayer-meeting.

The Church exists to spiritualise and consecrate the sphere of Commerce.

Nations have their ideals as well as persons. The Assyrian was force, the Greek was beauty, the Italian was art, and the English, like that of ancient Tyre, is commerce. We are 'the mart of nations,' the workshop of the world. Now commerce has its base side—its mercenary spirit inflaming the cupidity of those who engage in it, and its resources affording a proverbial facility for the corruption of morals. All this worst side of trade and commerce the old prophet, looking from Jerusalem across to Tyre, characterised as a prostitution of the soul to the love of gain, and he called it by the ugly name of *the harlot.* Often since has it been denounced in severe terms by men of ardent spirituality. But commerce has its nobler side; its pursuits are beneficent, and they may be, as they have often been,

Digitized by Google

tributary to the service of man and the glory of God. The same prophet who denounced its venality was constrained to admire its utility, and while he predicted the fall and disappearance of the old merchant city, he saw a new Tyre, a holy City, 'and her merchandise shall be holiness to the Lord; it shall not be treasured nor laid up; for her merchandise shall be for them that dwell before the Lord, to eat sufficiently, and for durable clothing.' In a word, commerce is necessary to the world, and in conjunction with mechanical science it gives man conquest of the forces of nature, and learns to distribute widely the treasures of earth, thereby furnishing his lower wants with ease, so as to free him from exhausting toil in behalf of food and raiment, and give him leisure for acquisitions of the higher and inward life. When commerce thus broadly and freely serves them who dwell before the Lord, her merchants will be 'princes' more than they ever were in any Tyre, ancient or modern, 'and her traffickers the honourable of the earth' who, with a common devotion, 'bring their glory and honour into the City of God.' In this City of the Golden Age the ruling ideals of commerce are not those of Mammon, but Christ's —not accumulation, show, and ease, but distribution, simplicity, and service; money is not a God, and men are not treated as machines for making it; the appalling extremes of wealth and poverty disappear, millionaires become as extinct as the mammoth, and Lazarus is seen no more at the rich man's gate; and wealth, if still largely retained in private hands, will only be a larger opportunity of service, 'not saying that any of the things which we possess is our own.'

The Church exists to spiritualise and regenerate Social Reform.

It holds in a trusteeship for widest use the one principle of regeneration, the one fertile incentive, the one seed of hope—even the life and love and fellowship of God in Christ—that

Digitized by Google

can lend a moral positiveness and an effective energy to efforts of social improvement. The diseases of civilisation have hitherto destroyed the great historic cities of the world, and hastened giant empires on their way to ruin. They are like the heads of a hydra which multiply as they are cut off by reforming hands. And they are still at work among us, gnawing into the heart of social and national life. To check and eradicate these—is it not the problem of problems? And where is the power adequate to such a task? It must come from Christ, from His Gospel—at once a moral Dynamic and moral Ideal; and it works in and through the Church of the Spirit, which is the home and citadel of the saving, spiritual forces that new-create men's hearts, reconstruct social arrangements on principles of justice, truth, and brotherhood, and thus realise the City of God on earth—the City of rest, grace, and harmony. Here is the one indestructible element in human society which, as it is set to keep guard at the gate of the City, secures that 'there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie. . . . And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it.'

What should the City of God be in the eyes of those who see it to be the presence and power as well as the prophecy and promise of a Divine and perfect society on earth? Surely it ought to be an aspiration and an effort, and at the same time an inspiration both to the one and the other.

It should be an aspiration. To weary saints looking into other worlds for the fulfilment of their desires still does the question apply, 'Why stand ye gazing up into heaven?' For the ideal of God is a City of His own building here, a City resting on His own name, and inhabited by His own presence. Men of aspiration are men who have worthy ideals, and this ideal of God—the splendid vision of a perfect society—is the greatest and most truly beneficent which we are able to conceive. With such an ideal, and such a Builder at work

Digitized by Google

to realise it, we should not only live in advance of our time, but put every possible future behind us. The hope of this Social Order inspires the best ideals of to-day and to-morrow. Social aspirations are becoming paramount. This age has been an age of physical science, and doubtless it has a record of brilliant speculations and achievements; but its novelty is now exhausted, and at its close it has succeeded in laying upon men an incubus of materialism which it feels half ashamed to own. The nineteenth century will be known as the age of physical science, but the twentieth century is likely to be known as the age of social science, the age of 'young men seeing visions and old men dreaming dreams' of the City of God. Let us ask God to write His name and the name of the Holy City upon us, that we may read some letters of that name for our inspiration and strength. Let the sense and dream of it abide in our hearts, that hours of solitude and darkness may shine with its descending light.

It should be an effort. What shall we do then to secure the descent of the City of God—to hasten the advent of a better order? Our citizenship in that city must underlie and regulate and transform all earthly citizenship. The City of God hangs over our city, our town, our village, wherever it may be; our faith should be to see a new London, a new Glasgow, a new Dumbarton, or whatever else it may be, and our task is to do all we can in helping to make it the City of God. Let the splendid vision, as we work, kindle our hearts into holy ardour, and move our hands to strenuous toil. We want a new Christ, a new heart, a new spirit of self-devotion to ideal ends, that will apply itself persistently in all departments of life. In the streets of our cities, through our citizen rights and duties, and in the midst of the incessant effort by which we are trying to make our way upwards, there must we be proving our connection with the Holy City on the fields of social life, and counting it an honour if we may but build the walls of the City at our door a little nearer Heaven before we go. Let us keep the Heavenly Pattern before our eyes, and with such

Digitized by Google

a widening horizon of interests and opportunities as these two citizenships—the heavenly and earthly—have in our time, let the sight more stir us to honourable emulation and enterprise than any vision that ever inspired crusader or knight-errant in the days of old.

Digitized by Google

Crown 8vo, cloth.

THE GOSPEL AND MODERN SUBSTITUTES.

By Rev. A. Scott Matheson, Dumbarton.

CONTENTS.

I. The Gospel and Modern Substitutes.
II. The Gospel and Agnosticism.
III. The Gospel and Science.
IV. The Gospel and Science—The Law of Heredity.
V. The Gospel and Science—The Law of Variation.
VI. The Gospel and Positivism.
VII. The Gospel and Socialism.
VIII. The Gospel and Socialism—Social Grievances.
IX. The Gospel and Socialism—The Distribution of Wealth.
X. The Gospel and Pessimism.
XI. The Gospel and Art.

'This fresh and suggestive book.'—*Daily Free Press.*

'Mr. Matheson shows most conclusively that if the representatives and interpreters of the Gospel would only give effect to its wholesome teaching—that is so human as well as divine, so far-reaching and all-embracing—many of those modern notions and theories would have no ground to stand upon either on account of their novelty or utility.'—*Scottish Congregationalist.*

'The author's aim is to claim for Christ the best of everything in Science, Positivism, and Socialism, and to make an eirenicon between Christianity and the systems of Comte, Darwin, Schopenhauer, and the Socialists.'—*The Rock.*

'Timely and suggestive. The breadth of survey and courageous grapple with some of the difficult social as well as the logical problems of the day gives this book a special value. For the preacher's library, to lend to the intelligent young men doubtfully inclined, and as a stimulus to the believer who seeks to cope with questions which on all sides assail him, the volume will prove most valuable.'—*Illustrated Missionary News.*

'We are always glad to welcome a book from a broad-minded writer like the Rev. A. Scott Matheson. . . . Will be found helpful in enabling Christian workers, while keeping in view the salvation of the individual as a primary object, to extend their thoughts to the leavening of the tendencies of the day—intellectual, social, or æsthetic—with that higher influence which ought to radiate through them all from Christ the Saviour of the world.'—*Record.*

'An exceedingly suggestive volume.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

'Very reasonable, intelligent, and well-written.'—*Scotsman.*

'An apology which ought, by the force of its reasoning and the candour of its tone, to disarm hostile criticism and win many to the faith of Christ.'—*British Weekly.*

'A strong, good book, and will commend itself by its candour and sympathy.'—*Nonconformist.*

EDINBURGH & LONDON
OLIPHANT ANDERSON & FERRIER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

FEB 27 1895
APR 8 1898
FEB 10 1903
JAN 22 1904

March 11

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google